A TREATISE OF THE VOCATION OF BISHOPS, AND OTHER ECCLESIASTICALL MINISTERS.

PROVING THE MINISTERS OF THE PRETENDED REFORMED CHVRCHES IN GENERALL, TO HAVE NO CALLING: AGAINST Monsieur du Plessis, and Mr. Doctour Feild:

And in particuler the pretended Bishops in England, to be no true Bishops. Against Mr. Mason.

By ANTH. CHAMP. P. and D. of *Sorbonne.*

He that entereth not by the doore into the fold of the sheepe, but climeth up an other way, he is a theife and a robber. Ioh. 10. 1.

I sent not the Prophets and they ran: I spake not vnto them, and they prophesied. Iere. 23. 21.

He cannot be esteemed Bishop, that contemning Apostolical tradition, and succeeding to none, is sprung vp from himselfe: for he can by no meanes neither haue, nor hold the Church, that is not ordained in the Church. S. Cypri. epist. 76. ad Magnum.

AT DOVAY,
By IOHN HEIGHAM. With Licence of Superiours. *Anno* 1616.

C 6126.16*

HARVARD COLLEGE
JUN 9 1923
LIBRARY

Treat fund

TO
Mr. GORGE ABBAT,
CALLED ARCH-BISHOP OF CANTERBVRY.

MAster *Francis Maſon* hauing (as he ſaith) receiued from you *direction and encouragement*, in making his booke *of the conſecration of the Bishops in the Church of England*, doth therefore preſent you with it, as due vnto you: And it ſeemeth to haue bin to your contentment, as ſufficiently performing that, which he pretendeth therein. For (as I haue heard) you conuented diuers Catholique Prieſts (whom you wrongfully kept in priſon) to teſtifie, that they had ſeene ſuch regiſters, as he citeth for the iuſtifying of your ordination; eſteeming (as may appeare) that nothing elſe wanted for the full clearing of that matter. VVhich ſole action vvas the firſt occaſion, that made me thinke of the diſproofe thereof. For perceiuing thereby, that you and your aſſiſtents, made reckoning of the booke, as of a full iuſtification of your calling, I thought it labour neither idly, nor ill beſtovved to make you ſee, (ſithence you either did not, or vvould not ſee it before) how farre short it commeth of that marke. I addreſſe therefore this Treatiſe vnto you, to the end that compating it vvith *M. Maſons* Apologetical Dialogue, you may

iudge vvhether he hath indeed performed that, vvhich he ſo confidently affirmeth in the firſt face of his booke to vvit, *to haue iuſtified the conſecration of the Bishops of the Church in England, to containe nothing contrary to the Scriptures, Councels, and Fathers, or approoued example of Primitiue antiquitie*. You may peraduenture maruell, that I ſhould put the trial of this matter to you, knovving you ſo farre intereſted therein as you are. But the reaſon is, becauſe I hold the negatiue ſo euident, that I am perſvvaded you cannot, vvithout forfaiture of your iudgment, determine the contrary.

If you had not hindred the publication of the booke vvritten not many yeares agoe, of this ſubiect, by intercepting the vvritten copy, vvhich, (knovving belike that it cannot be anſvvered) you ſtill retaine, I might and vvould haue ſpared this labour, or haue other-vvaies beſtovved it. But ſeeing you are not content, only to hinder the diſcouery of your no vocation, but doe ſet others on vvorke to maintaine and bolſter it vp, to the preiudice of the truth, you cannot iuſtly complaine, if by this occaſion, that be laid open to the view of the vvorld, vvhich you deſire ſhould remaine vnſeene, and vnknowne.

If you finde your ſelfe proued here to be no Bishop, but a meere Vſurper of that title, I vvil deſire (though I cannot greatly hope) that you ſhould either depoſe it, or at leaſt make your ſelfe capable thereof. But if you thinke there is no ſuch thing here performed, I vvill expect that you ſhould encourage either *M. Maſon*, or ſome other, to ſatisfie the arguments heere propoſed to proue the ſame. If not, your ſilence ſhal be interpreted an acknovvledgement of that vvhere vvith you are here charged, that is, of your no lavvfull miniſtery and ordi-

ordination, and consequently of your no Church, no Faith, no meane of saluation. All vvhich important consequences euidently follow, of your vvant of lawfull calling and ordination. And so vvishing you vvith all my heart, as much loue to the Catholike truth (vvithout vvhich your soule shall neuer see vvith ioy the face of Iesus Christ) as you shevv hatred against it; I leaue you to his holy disposition, *who would haue all men saued, and to come to the knowledge of his truth.* 1. Tim. 2. 4.

Your seruant and frinde as you

are Gods and his Churches:

A. CHAMPNEY.

The Preface to the Reader.

IF Master Mason *(courteous Reader) in his Booke* of the consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England, *had either directly proued their lawfull calling, or impugned that of the Bishops of the Catholike Roman church, he might haue expected from his Catholike aduersaries some answer to the same. But seeing he pretendeth onely to cleare them, from the iust imputations laid vpon them by Catholike Authors (which he calleth slanders) and thereby maketh himselfe only Defendant, he cannot with any reason, expect from them any reply, in forme of answer, to his booke. For there are few but know this difference betweene the defendant, and the Plaintiffe or Appellant: that the Defendant must necessarily answer to all and euery obiection brought against him whereas the Appellant is not bound to reply, to his answers made to euery obiection, but may (if he thinke good to impugne either his answeres, or the cause he maintaineth) make his choice of one, two, three, or moe, as he shall thinke most for his aduantage. Which if he can in such sort enforce against his aduersary, as he is not able to satisfie them, he shall clearly gaine his cause against him. For example, he that being accused of felonie, or treason, and therefore defedant, is necessarily constrayned to answer to all, and euery important accusation laid against him, and if he faile in the answer but of one only, he wil be found guilty; whereas his aduersary being appellant, is not tied for the euicting of his cause, to reply vpon his answer to euery accusation, but may make free*

free choice of ſuch, and ſo many, either of his former accuſations, or any other, as he findeth fitteſt for his purpoſe, which if he can preſſe in ſuch ſort, as the defendant cannot auoid them, he shal conuict him to be guilty. M. Maſon *therefore making himſelfe meerely Defendant in this quarrel, is not to expect that I, intending as Appellant, to proue their Biſhops to haue no lawfull calling, ſhould reply vpon euery parcell of his whole booke, in forme of anſwer to that which he ſaith. For beſides that this would coſt both me, and the Reader more labour, then the thing is worth, it is no way neceſſary for my purpoſe: which is not to anſwer him (who making himſelfe Defendant hath the place of the anſwerer) but to impugne the thing that he would maintaine; which whether I haue performed effectually or no, notwithſtanding the anſweres which he hath already made in this his booke, I leaue to the cenſure of the iudicious though otherwiſe partiall Reader.*

Furthermore M. Maſon *thorow his whole Booke making choice only of ſuch arguments, as he thinketh good to propoſe againſt himſelfe, and vrging them only ſo farre, as he thinketh he can make ſome shew of ſoluing them (like vnto little children that build Caſtles of Tile-ſhards, and afterwards pleaſe themſelues in throwing them downe) cannot hope that his aduerſary ſhould fauour him ſo farre, as (leauing his beſt aduantage either in the choice of his arguments, or in the maner of vrging them) to beſtow his time and trauell in refuting the anſweres, which he frameth to his owne obiections. This fauourable courſe (to deale plainly) I intend not to hold with* M. Maſon. *Yet will I promiſe him, that where I finde he ſaith any thing, either for the preuenting, or anſwering any argument here by me propoſed, it shal not be diſſembled, but ſet downe in his owne words, and peraduenture vrged farther, then it is by him, which is as much, as he can with any reaſon expect at my hands in this cauſe. But, (to note this by the way) why is* M. Maſon *ſo could in this matter*

of their calling, that he proposeth not to himselfe to proue it, neither by Scripture, Traditions, Councels, *nor Fathers, (all which kinde of proofes he knoweth to be authenticall with vs) but only pretendeth* to cleare it from the slanders, and odious imputations of the Romanists, and to iustifie it to containe nothing contrary to the Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, or approued examples of primitiue antiquity. *It is knowne they exact of Catholikes with all rigour and instance, positiue and precise proofe of Scripture for their doctrine in all points of controuersie. Why doth not therefore* M. Mason *bring at least such proofes, of Traditions,* Councels, *or Fathers (which he knoweth are not reiected by vs) for their new ministery, but contenteth himselfe with the buckler, and standeth only vpon his defence? Marry for this reason: that neither Scriptures,* Councels, *Fathers, or Traditions yeeld him any one positiue proofe of their vocation; or if they doe, I chalenge him to produce it, and he shall gaine his cause. Neither will I bind him to finde his proofes out of the Fathers within the first fiue hundreth yeares after Christ, as M. Iewel did in his bragging challinge, and yet was reprehended by his brethren for being ouer liberall: but I giue him for this purpose the whole 1500. yeares.*

In the face of his booke.

D. Humfray in the life of Iewel. saith he gaue the Papists to large a scope: and M. Fulk hath the like in his Retentiue, pag. 55.

Againe, (to come yet more neere him) what doth he thinke is sufficient, to cleare and iustifie their calling, to containe nothing contrary to the Scriptures, Fathers, Councels, and Antiquities? *Will he say it is a sufficient iustification of this point, not to be driuen by force of argument, to confesse that it is against the Scriptures Fathers, &c.? If he will say so, I make no doubt, but he hath or will iustifie the consecrations, and calling of their Bishops and Ministers, to containe nothing contrary to the Scripture &c. But though he be absurd enough in many things, as will appeare hereafter, yet I cannot think him so absurd as to affirme this. For so shall he be constrained to confesse, that*

the

the Arrians, and all the obstinate heretiques that euer haue bene, haue iustified their heresies to containe nothing contrary to scripture &c. none of them hauing yet euer bene constrained by force of argument, to confesse their doctrine to be contrary thervnto.

He will peraduenture saie, that ouer and besides this, he will shew the obiections made against their Bishops, to be but slanders, and odious imputations. *But how will he shew this? by any other meanes, then by such, as the Arrians, and all other heretiques pretended to shew, the arguments of the Catholique Doctors against their heresies, to be but slanders? that is by making shew of framing some kind of answere to them, that they might not be said to be ouercome, and forced to graunt the falsity of their heresie. In this sort surely, and no other, doth M. Mason iustifie the consecration, and calling of their Bishops to containe nothing contrary to scripture, as will appeare in the processe of our dispute.*

And now must I acquaint thee (good reader) with the reason for which, hauing vndertaken to proue the nullity, of our new English Bishops their consecrations, and calling, against M. Mason, I enlarge my selfe so farre, as to disproue also that, of all the other falsly tearmed reformed churches; which reason is this. Knowing that the whole multitude of heresies, that pester the world at this time (as likewise all other which haue, or shalbee) are by no one kind of argument so easily and euidently refuted, as by that of the calling of their pastors: And hauing occasion offered me by M. Masons braning apology for the Protestant Bishops of England, to shew the nullity of their consecratiō and vocatiō; Which though it haue the greatest outward appearance of lawfull calling, of any other of the new stampe, and therfore it being refuted the rest might be thaught to be sufficiently refuted with it yet it being proper onlie to the pretended church of England, yea and not to that wholly (the Puritanes, Brownists,

Familians, and Anabaptiſts diſclaiming from it as papiſticall and ſuperſtitious) I conſidered that it was not to any great purpoſe, for the impugning of all theſe hereſies, to refell it alone and leaue the others vntouched. Therfore I reſolued to make this treatiſe generall, and to ſhew that no one of the new churches, called of the reformation, haue any true paſtors, and conſequently cannot be any true churches, nor therfore haue any true faith, or meanes of ſaluation. And becauſe in all good methode thoſe queſtions, that treate of matters more generall, goe before thoſe that handle the more particuler, therfore in my diſcourſe, haue thoſe queſtions the firſt place, that treate of the more generall points pertaining to this matter.

Yet becauſe my purpoſe is ſpecially to diſprooue the calling, and conſecration of the Biſhops in England, as well for that it is peculiar to our owne countrie, (and it being diſprooued, the reſt can haue no great probability, for that it hath more shew of true calling then all the reſt) as alſo for that the calling of the miniſters of the French churches, which are the ſame with our Puritans, is already vnanſwerably refuted, by that famous prelate, and terrour of the heretiques of thoſe daies Cardinall of Perron, in a proper treatiſe of that ſubiect, ſet forth long ſince, yet neuer anſwered, and ſo much therof hereafter related, as pertaineth to the matter there in queſtion, for theſe reaſons (I ſay) I ſtand longer vpon that point by much, then vpon all the reſt. If M. Maſon or anie other, ſhall thinke good, to continue the defence of this cauſe, let him frame a pertinent anſwere to the arguments here propoſed, and he may expect a like reply, if God giue health and aſſiſtance. In the meane while if thou (courteous reader) canſt make any vſe of this my trauaile, for the maintaining of the Catholique truth, and rooting out of the contrarie, either in thy ſelfe or others, I ſhall eſteem

me my paines very sufficiently recompensed and so I commend thee to Gods holy grace.

THE CONTENTS OF THE BOOKE.

1. Chapter. THe true reaſon vvhy ſo many in theſe daies doe erre in faith, and that many not haue difficulty to find the true faith. *Page* 1.

2. Chap. Certaine principles of this preſent controuerſie touching the vocation of Eccleſiaſticall miniſters or magiſtrates cõfeſſed and agreed vpon as well by Proteſtants as by Catholiques. *page* 9.

3. Chap. It is no ſufficient proofe of lavvfull calling to miniſtery of Gods vvord and Sacraments, that any one be iudged either by himſelfe, or others, or both, fit and able to exerciſe that charge and functiõ. *pa.* 13.

4. Chap. That one iudged by himſelfe or others fit for the miniſtring of Gods vvord and Sacramẽts, though ſuch as are in office are ſuppoſed not to diſcarge rightly their duties, cannot lavvfully take vpon him that office, as ſufficiently called therunto: neither is ſuch a iudgment and opinion any ſufficient calling. *pag.* 15.

5. Chap. That the truth of doctrine is not a ſufficient proofe of true and lavvfull calling to the miniſtery of Gods vvord and Sacraments, nor is it any aſſured meanes for a preacher and paſtor, to prooue himſelfe authentically called to that charge, for him to alleage that the doctrine vvhich he teacheth is good and true. *page* 41.

6. Chap. That the ſole election of the people is not a ſufficient vvarrant and calling to the lavvfull miniſtery of Gods vvord and Sacraments. *page* 54.

7. Chap. Not all ordination, conſecration, or impoſitiõ of hands is a ſufficient calling to the adminiſtratiõ of Gods vvord and Sacraments. *page* 63.

The

8. Chap. The defects found in the callings to the miniſtery hitherto refuted cannot be ſupplied by any extraordinary calling, not is there novv in the church of Chriſt, any extraordinary calling to the miniſtery of Gods vvord and Sacraments. *page* 78.

9. Chap. Not all externall ordination, or conſecration by ſuch as beare the name and pretēd to be Bishops, is a ſufficient and true calling to the miniſtery of Gods vvord and Sacraments. *page* 115.

10. Chap. The calling of the novv English ſuperintendents cannot be lavvfull, ſuppoſing that of the Bishops of the Romane church, from vvhich it is taken, to be vnlavvfull. *page* 130.

11. Chap. Cranmer continued not lavvfull Bishop till his death. *page* 141.

12. Chap. That the Bishops made in King Edvvards daies vvere no true, or lavvfull Bishops. *page* 151.

13. Chap. The vvhole eſſentiall matter, and forme of Epiſcopall order cōſiſt not in impoſitiō of hands, and theſe vvordes, receiue thou the holy ghoſt. *page* 158.

14. Chap. That M. Parker bearing ſometime the name of Archbishop of Cāterbury, vvas not true and lavvfull Bishop.. *page* 188.

15. Chap. That M. Grindall, M. Horne vvith the reſt preferred to Bishopricks in the beginning of Q. Elizabeths raigne vvere not true, and lavvfull Bishops. *page* 202.

16. Chap. Of the oath of the Princes ſupremacy, for denying vvherof the old Bishops vvere depriued. *page* 218.

17. Chap. Thoſe that ſucceeded M. Parker, and the reſt in the places of Bishops, dovvne to this preſent daie, neither vvere nor are true, and lavvfull Bishops. *page* 241.

18. Chap. That neither the preſent ſuperintendents in England haue, nor their Proteſtant predeceſſors euer had any lavvfull Epiſcopall iuriſdiction. page 310.

APPROBATIO DOCTORVM.

Nos infraſcripti legimus diligenter librum Anglicè ſcriptum cuius titulus eſt. *Tractatus de vocatione Epiſcoporum & aliorum Eccleſiæ miniſtrorum: quo omnes cuiuſcunque prætenſæ reformationis miniſtelli legitimacarere vocatione probantur, contra* Pleſſeum & Fieldeū: *quo etiam peculiariter præſentes Angliæ ſuperintendentes falsò Epiſcopi vocari conuincūtur, cōtra* Maſoniū: Antho. Chāpneo *Doctore Sorbonico authore.* In eoq; nihil inuenimus quod ſacroſanctæ fidei Catholicæ, Apoſtolicæ, Romanæ repugnet, vel morum ſanctitati præiudicet, quinimo veritatem Catholicam doctè & neruoſe propugnat, & contrariam hæreſim ſolidè, detegit & confutat, quare digniſsimum iudicamus qui ad vtilitatem publicam gentis Anglorum prælo mādetur vt publicetur. Pariſijs 29. Ianuarij 1616.

Frater Gabriel de S. Maria Theologiæ Doctor, Theologus Maclouienſium, Benedictinorum Maclouienſium Prior, & pro tempore inſignis monaſterij & ordinis Fontiſebrardenſis viſitator.

Guilielmus Bishope Theologicæ facultatis Pariſienſis Doctor.

Henricus Dei & ſanctæ ſedis Apoſtolicæ gratia Pariſienſis Epiſcopus, Omnibus præſentes inſpecturis ſalutem in Domino. Notū facimus quod viſo publico teſtimonio quo duo ſupraſcripti Doctores Theologi nationis Anglicæ ſanctè profeſsi ſunt diligenter ſe legiſſe librum Anglico idiomate ſcriptum de vocatione Epiſcoporum & aliorum Eccleſiæ miniſtrorum &c. Authore Anthonio Chāpnæo Doctore Sorbonico. In eoque nihil inueniſſe quod ſacroſanctæ fidei Romanæ repugnet, vel morum ſanctitati præiudicet, quinimo veritatem Catholicam doctè & neruosè propugnat, contrariamque hæreſim detegit & refutat; permiſimus prædicto M. Antho. Chāpneo illum in lucem emittere. Datum Pariſijs die tertia Februarij 1616.

De mandato præfati R^mi. Domini mei Domini Pariſienſis Epiſcopi.

Baudouyn.

THE APPROBATION OF DOCTORS.

We vnderwritten haue diligently reade a booke writtē in English, intituled. *A treatise of the vocation of Bishops and other Ecclesiasticall ministers, wherin all the ministers of whatsoeuer pretended reformatiō are proued to haue no lawfull calling: against M. du Plessis and D. Field: and wherin the present superintendentes in England are conuinced not to be true Bishops, against M. Mason. By Anth. Champney Doctor of Sorboune:* and haue found nothing therin contrary either to the holy Catholique, Apostolique, and Romane faith, or good māners: but the Catholique truth learnedly and forcibly maintained, and the contrary heresie soundly confuted and detected; wherfore we iudge it very worthy to be published in print for the publique profit of all English men. At Paris the 29. of Ianuarie 1616.

Brother Gabriel of S. Maries D. in Diuinity, Theologall of S. Maloes, Prior of the Benedictins of S. Maloes, and for the present visiter of the renowned monastary and order of Fonteurauld.

P William Bish.p Doctor of diuinity of the faculty of Paris.

THE BISHOP OF PARIS HIS PERMISSION for the printing of the same Booke.

Henry by the grace of God and of the holy see Apostolique Bishop of Paris: To all those that shall see these presents, health in our Lord. Be it knowne that vpon the sight of the publique testimony of the aboue writtē Doctors in diuinity of the English nation, wherin they faithfully professe to haue diligently read a booke in English written in English intituled. *A treatise of the vocation of Bishops and other Ecclesiasticall ministers &c. By Ant. Champney Doctor of Sorboune:* and that they haue found nothing therin repugnant either to the holy Catholique Romane faith, or good manners, but contrariwise that the Catholique truth is therin learnedly and forceably maintained, and the contrary heresie detected and confuted, we haue permitted the said Anth. Champney to put it forth. Giuen at Paris the 3. of Februarie 1616.

By the commandement of the aforesaid my most Reuerend Lord the L. Bishop of Paris. *Bandowyn.*

A TREATISE OF THE VOCATION OF BISHOPS AND other Ecclesiasticall *Ministers*.

The first Chapter.

The true reason why so many in these daies doe erre in faith, and that many moe haue difficulty to finde the true faith.

IF men were but halfe as circumspect and wary, in those things that appertaine to their eternall felicitie, as vsually they are in those that concern their temporall prosperity, (whereas reason would they should be more) they could not be so often and fowly deceiued in them, as they are. For God of his infinite goodnesse and equall wisdome, hath prouided them of meanes to auoid all error and deceit, in the things perrayning to their eternall felicity, by so much more easie and assured, then in the affaires of this world, by how much more the error or deceit in them, is more hurtfull and lesse recouerable, then in these: and therefore in respect of them, hath he promised to make *a way so plaine and direct, that the very fooles shal not erre or goe astray in it*, which he hath no where promised in respect of these. Esay 35. 8.

How commeth it then to passe, (will some say) that so many doe daily erre, and many moe doe greatly complaine, of

the difficulty in finding the true way to saluation: And not without reason as it seemeth, there being so many diuers waies proposed, whereof euery one is auouched by some to be the only true way? The reason hereof is easily giuen, and the remedy of the euil which it bringeth, as easily found, and not with much more difficulty practised, if men be willing to embrace it.

2. The principall yea peraduenture the sole reason, why so many (not only now adaies, but in all times) haue and doe goe astray from the way of saluation erring *from the true faith with out which it is impossible to please God*; and that many moe haue difficulty to finde thesame: is because they first seeke to know what they should beleeue, before they know, or seek to know whom they shou'd beleeue, or of whom they should learne their faith and beliefe. This to some may peraduenture at the first, seeme either improbable, or at least doubtfull. Because it may be thought little to import of whom a man knoweth, or is taught the truth, so that he know it indeed: as in the like case, it importeth little or nought at all, of whom, or by whose counsell or meanes a sicke man recouereth his health, so that he be truely cured: or by whom he that is bound for Hierusalem (for example) is taught the way, so that he be shewed the true way. Yet that which I said is most true, as shall manifestly appeare euen by these familiar examples proposed. For if a sicke man or traueller should consult and take directions, the one for his health, the other for his iourny, of such as are as little skilfull in these matters as themselues, are they not in euident danger to be deceiued? And if they inquire of others, of whose knowledge they haue no more assurance, then of the first, they may well be brought into more doubt and perplexity (one telling them one thing, and another the quit contrary) but they shall be neuer a whit further, the one from danger of going astray in his iourney, the other from encreasing his disease. Euident therfore it is, that the first thing these men are to seeke, is to know, who can giue them true directions, and teach them how to finde that which they seeke, and which they desire to finde.

Heb. 11. 6.

3. And this will be much more euident, if wee put the case, that these men know, or at least may most easily know, that there are appointed by publike authority men to direct and guide them in all their doubts and difficulties, whose directions

and aduiſe if they follow they ſhall not be deceiued: and withall are farther aduertized, that there are others, who vpon pretext of more skill then is in thoſe that are publikely authoriſed, will not only offer their counſell and aduiſe, but will thruſt it vpon men, as the only neceſſary meane to finde that which they deſire: whoſe counſell notwithſtanding and aduiſe if they follow, they ſhall without faile be deceiued. Theſe two things (I ſay) ſuppoſed, it is moſt cleare, that hee that will not in theſe caſes be deceiued, muſt neceſſarily firſt and before all things ſeeke to know who can truly inſtruct, and direct him in his doubts, as appointed thereunto by publike authority, that afterwards hee may ſecurely learne of him or them what hee is to doe, and what courſe he is to hold, for the atrayning of that he deſireth; whether it be the recouery of his health, or the proſperous atchiuing of his iourney.

4. Euen ſo and no otherwiſe doth it fare with all Chriſtians, in the great and weighty affaire of their eternall felicity. For there is no Chriſtian but either knoweth, or may moſt eaſily know theſe two things. Firſt that God hath authorized and eſtabliſhed here vpon earth publike Officers, and Paſtors to direct and guid all men in the true way to life euerlaſting, and to teach them the only true faith: whoſe directions and conduct whoſoeuer followeth, ſhall not goe aſtray nor erre. Secondly, that there are others, who hauing no commiſſion or authority at all in theſe affaires, doe not withſtanding take vpon them the charge of Teachers and Guides in this weighty buſineſſe, pretending to haue more skill, and knowledge therein, (and therefore more right to that office and function) then the publikely authorized Paſtours haue: but indeed, teaching falſe doctrine, and new waies of their owne intention, lead all their followers into eternall ruine. There is nothing more euident and certaine, to thoſe that beleeue the holy Scriptures then theſe two things. For God by his wiſdome forſeeing that the ignorance or error in either of theſe things could not ſtand with the true meane to bring men to life euerlaſting: (the errour in the firſt, taking away the meane to know, whom they ſhould follow or beleeue; and the errour in the ſecond, not permitting them to know whom they ſhould flie and auoid) hath himſelfe moſt clearely and euidently teſtified both the one and the o-

Math. 28. 19. 20. ther in the receiued and acknowledged text of his sacred word.

5. The first is testified in these words: *Going teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to obserue all things, which I haue commanded you. And behold, I am with you all daies, euen to the consummation of the world.* Here we see commission giuen and Pastors appointed to teach all men, all things, which are to be obserued, for the gayning of the kingdome of heauen: and this commission is to last vntill the end of the world. And that we should not feare that they might deceiue vs, teaching that which they ought not, or which is against their masters doctrine: he saith vnto them elsewhere. *He that heareth you, heareth mee; and he that dispiseth you, dispiseth mee:* whereby we are taught, with what security and confidence we both may and ought to embrace their instructions and follow their conduct. The same verity is deliuered by S. *Paul* in these words. *He gaue some Apostles, some Prophets, some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consumation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the ministery, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, vntill we all meete in the vnity of faith.* Where we see Commissioners appointed by soueraigne authority, to teach and instruct all men to their eternall saluation, and their commission to endure for euer vntill the world shall faile. The true function and charge of which Teachers, the Apostle declareth in the words following, to be the certaine knowledge of the truth, saying: *That now we be not children wauering, and carried about with euery wind of doctrine.* And these so cleare testimonies of the holy Ghost, are more then sufficient to conuince this verity, though it were gainsaied by any, as it is not. For none of those that glory in the falsly named reformation, doe deny, that God hath appointed Pastors in his Church to teach his people the truth of his doctrine: or that all men are bound to heare, and learne of them, as shall appeare more amply heereafter.

Pastours are appointed by God to teach truth.

Luc. 10. 16.

Ephes. 4. 11. 12, 13.

6. The second point before mentioned, is as manifestly testified by the warning which our Sauior giueth vs in these words, *Take yee great heed of false Prophets, which come to you in the clothing of sheepe, but inwardly are rauening wolues.* And S. *Paul* in like manner. *I know that after my departure, there will rauishing wolues enter in among you, not sparing the flocke.* And of this kind of cattle, are we so often and so plainly forwarned in holy Scripture, that wonder it is, that

Math. 7. 15. *False teachers foretold.*

Acts 20. 29.

UMI

any one that pretendeth to beleeue ſcripture, ſhould be ſoe-
luded by them, as we daily ſee many are. But the true reaſon
hereof is that which was ſaid before, that men hauing ſmall re-
gard of their eternall felicity, doe not care what maſters they
follow or of whom they learne their beliefe, and other things
neceſſary for their ſaluation: whereas they ſhould firſt with
competent diligence ſeeke out thoſe maſters who are by ſoue-
raigne authority ordained to teach them, (who are not hard
to be found, as ſhall by and by appeare) and then with like dili-
gence, but with all ſecurity learne, what they ought to beleeue
and doe. For ſeeing God hath ſo euidently teſtified that he hath
prouided ſuch guides to direct vs in the true way to eternall feli-
city, as following them we follow himſelfe; and further that if
we follow any other teaching contrary to them, we ſhall fol-
low rauening wolues, what faire ſhew ſo euer they make: who
can doubt but the firſt thing, that any man that deſireth to ſaue
his ſoule, is to ſeeke to know who thoſe guides appointed by
God are, that hauing found them, he may ſecurely learne of
them the true way to euerlaſting life.

7. Though this diſcourſe be of it ſelfe cleare, and euident,
yet becauſe it is a certaine ground of that which is to be ſaid
hereafter, it wil not be amiſſe to confirme it yet further, for
which purpoſe ſerue moſt fitly theſe words of S. *Paul*. *Whoſoeuer* Rom. 10. 13.
ſhall inuocate the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaued, how then ſhall they inuocate 14.
him, in whom they haue not beleeued? or how ſhall they beleeue him whom
they haue not heard? and how ſhall they heare without a Preacher? and how
ſhall they preach vnleſſe they be ſent? Thus ſaith Saint *Paul*. Whereby it
is euident, that before we can know, what we ought to beleeue,
we muſt firſt know, whom we ought to beleeue. For ſeeing
we cannot (as S. *Paul* ſaith) beleeue, vnleſſe we heare or be taught,
and that we cannot heare and be taught by euerie one, but only
by ſuch as are ſent, and authoriſed to teach vs, we muſt neceſ-
ſarily, vnleſſe we wittingly be deceiued, firſt and before all things
ſeeke to know, who thoſe are that haue commiſſion, warrant,
and authority to teach vs, that of them we ſecurely learne what
we are to beleeue.

And this courſe or order of learning our faith, ſo plainly ex-
preſſed in holy Scripture, is alſo moſt conformable to that me-
thode which nature her ſelfe obſerueth in teaching vs naturall

knowledge: first making knowne vnto vs the things that are moſt eaſie, that by the helpe thereof, we may raiſe our thoughts, and ſtudies to higher and more obſcure matters. So the heathen Philoſophers by the knowledge of Gods creatures roſe vp to the knowledge of their Creator, as S. *Paul* witneſſeth. Rom. 1. Therefore it being a farre more eaſie thing, to know who thoſe are that are authoriſed, and appointed to teach vs our faith, then it is to know what our faith is, or what we ought to beleeue: As it is a farre more eaſie thing in any common-wealth, to know who is a true and lawfull iudge, then to know what is right iudgement in any difficult caſe in law. We are bound vnder paine of peruerting, not only Gods expreſſe ordinance, declared out of holy Scripture, but alſo the courſe of nature it ſelfe in learning our faith. Firſt to learne who can teach vs our beleefe, as being authoriſed thereunto, and then after to learne of them, what we ought to beleeue.

8 The ſame thing is yet made more manifeſt by this euident reaſon. Faith is a knowledge, which is not gotten by ſubtility of wit, or diligent ſtudy (being aboue the reach of either) but only by authority and reuelation, Saint *Paul* teſtifying that *faith is had by hearing*. Rom. 10. 17. Therefore they only, whom God appointeth to teach vnto others thoſe things which it pleaſeth him to reueale, are able to teach vs what we ought to beleeue, or what is reuealed from God: and if any other vndertake to teach vs contrary thereunto, we may and ought vndoubtedly to eſteeme their doctrine, not to be reuealed from God, but to be inuented by themſelues. Rom. 10. For how can they reueale vnto vs Gods moſt hidden ſecrets, being not ſent, nor inſtructed by him therein? and this is S. *Pauls* owne argument in the place before cited. And moſt ancient *Tertullian* deduceth the ſame reaſon in this ſort.

De preſcriptio. cap. 21. *If our Lord Ieſus Chriſt hath ſent his Apoſtles to preach, other Preachers then they who Chriſt ſent, are not to be receiued, becauſe* (loe the reaſon) *neither doth any but the Sonne know the Father, and to whom the Sonne hath reuealed him, neither hath the Sonne reuealed him to any, but the Apoſtles whom he ſent to preach that which he hath reuealed.*

9. Here ſome may ſay, ſeeing we haue the holy Scriptures, wherin God hath reuealed vnto vs all his wil and councell, what great neceſſity is there of other Teachers, or why may not euery one inſtruct, and informe himſelfe by Gods written word, with-

out seeking out any other master to be taught by ? This same question is so farre from shewing that Pastors are not necessary in Gods Church that it sheweth them to be most necessary, notwithstanding the vse of the written word of God. For seeing there are some that read the holy Scriptures, and yet doe not find therin the necessity of Pastors, though so expressly contayned in them, as the places before cited doe shew they are, is it not euident that they had neede of teachers, to make them see, what is reuealed to them in holy Scriptures ? For with those, that make this obiection I would argue thus. Either you finde in the holy Scriptures the necessity of Pastours, Doctors, and Teachers to be in Gods church, notwithstanding the benefit of the written word of God, or you finde no such thing at all : if you find it, then must you beleeue it, as being taught by Gods holy word, if you beleeue the Scripture : if you finde it not, then had you much more neede of Pastours, and Doctours to teach you the contents of holy Scripture, seeing you doe not finde in them that, which they so expressly containe.

The Scriptures teach vs as wel the manner how to learne our belief by our Pastours, as what we are to beleeue : and that is first to be learned.

Where it is to be obserued, that this argument concludeth not only directly against those, that admit not the necessity of Pastours and Doctours in Gods Church (if any should deny them) but also indirectly against those that either say, the Pastors may be iudged by their sheepe in matter of doctrine : or that the decision of the question of the calling of Pastours ought not necessarily goe before the decision of other questions of doctrine, when there is doubt of both. As for example, that the examination of this question, whether *Luther*, had true calling, and consequently was true Pastour or no, ought not to goe before the examination of this point of his doctrine, whether after the fall of *Adam* man haue freewill or no : and the like. For first, it is euidently against the nature and instruction of Pastours, and Doctours, to be guided and taught by those ouer whom they haue the charge of Teachers and Gouernors. But if they chance to erre, they are to be taught and iudged by other Pastours, and not by their own sheepe : because the Disciple cannot be aboue his master. Secondly, when any one is found to teach new doctrine, and is not knowne from whence he commeth, or who sent him to preach that doctrine, his calling and commission is first of all to be examined, and afterwards his doctrine, and

not first his doctrine, and then his calling. And the reason is, not only because it is more easie to know when a man hath true calling, then which is true doctrine (as is said before) and therefore men are not so subiect to be deceiued in the one as in the other but also because, if hee be found without true calling, let his doctrine be neuer so true, he shall be esteemed a rebell and traytor to God and his Church, and all those that follow him, and therefore can haue no right to dispute of doctrine as a Pastor but ought to heare aud learne of the true Pastours as a sheepe, though he esteeme himselfe neuer so fit and able to teach others. *For not he that commendeth himselfe is approued, but whom God commendeth.* As in the like cause euery officer or magistrate executing any office in the name of the Prince, must first shew his letters whereby he hath power to execute that office, before he can iustifie his proceedings in the same, whether they be according to equity or noe. For let them be neuer so iust and vpright, yet if he be found to haue no commission to exercise that office, both he and all those that obey him, shall be iudged rebels, and traytours to his Prince. So that by this whole discourse it remayneth manifest, that he that will not erre, and be deceiued in his beleefe, which importeth his eternall saluation, must first seeke to know (if he know it not already) whom he may beleeue in matter of faith, and then study to know of them, what he must beleeue; and not first seeke to know, what he must beleeue, before he know who may teach him, as hauing authority therunto. This ground being laid as partly confessed of all parts, and proued by manifest testimony of holy Scripture, and euident naturall reason, it only remaineth to search out by what assured meanes they may be knowne, who are by Gods soueraigne power and authority, approued and appointed to teach and gouerne his people in true faith, or in the true way to saluation, which being no harder to be knowne, (as by the ensuing discourse, shall appeare) then the ciuill magistrates, and officers in any common-wealth or kingdome, are knowne and discerned from vsurpers, and intruders, the way to eternall felicity will appeare to be *so plaine and direct as the very foolish* (vnlesse they be wilfully and wittingly blind) *cannot goe astray therein*. And therefore that which was said in the beginning of this Chapter is found euidently true, that if men were but half [illegible] wary, and carefull, in those things that appertaine to their [illegible]

Act. n. 7.

2. Cor. 10. 17

See the reason heerof in the 2. and 3. cap. n. 2.

Esai. 35. 8.

nall felicitie, as they cuſtomarily are in thoſe that belong to their temporall eſtates, they could not be ſo fowly deceiued therin, as dayly experience teacheth they are.

The whole drift and ſcope therfore of this inſuing diſcourſe is, to ſhew who thoſe are whom we ought to beleeue, or who they are that haue authority from God to teach vs our faith and beliefe.

The ſecond Chapter.

Certaine principles of this preſent controuerſy touching the vocation of Eccleſiaſticall miniſters or magiſtrates confeſſed and agreed vpon as well by Proteſtants as by Catholiques.

1. FOR the auoiding of ſuperfluous, and needles queſtions, and alſo that our diſpute may proceed both more groundedly and with better order, I thinke it not amiſſe before I goe any farther to ſet downe ſome grounds and principles pertayning to this preſent controuerſie, wherin either partie contending doth agree, and which do ſpecially ſerue for the true deciſion of the whole matter in queſtion. Where I would haue thee (Iudicious reader) to note by the way, that it is the Proteſtants miniſtery only (ſo I tearme for this time all the pretended Reformiſts) that is in queſtion, whether it haue any lawfull calling or no. For the vocation of the Catholike Roman Prieſts and Paſtors, was neuer by their aduerſaries called into queſtion or diſpute. A thing worthy of ſpeciall note, as an euident argument, that it is clearly good and Canonicall; or at leaſt ſufficient, otherwiſe it could not haue eſcaped the ſeuere cenſure, of ſome one at leaſt, of ſo many moſt bitter and ſerpentin eyed enemies, as haue theſe many hundreth yeares for one quarrell or other ſought the ouerthrow of that church. To which purpoſe they could neuer, or euer can haue ſo effectuall a meane, as to ſhew her Paſtors to haue no lawfull calling. But this being ſo out of all controuerſy, as they could not faſten vpon her anie light ſuſpitiõ therof, they alwaies haue choſen to impugne her by other meanes, euer leauing this

vntouched; which notwithstanding if shee were not, or had not been the true spouse and church of Christ, would first haue been espied, and most hotly persecuted. But this by the way only. Now let vs go forward.

Confess: of. Genua art. 29. & 31. Confess: of England art. 23.

2. The Protestants agree with the Catholiques first, that the office and charge of preaching, and ministring Sacraments in Gods church, requireth necessarily a speciall power and authoritie, to the lawfull and auailable exercise therof. Which is to say that if any man vndertake to exercise the same, not hauing such authoritie, his fact shall not only be vnlawfull and wicked, but also voide and without all effect, as being destitute of sufficient power and commission, They therefore that shall attempt any such fact, without authoritie, and not only they, but all their followers and fauourers, are guiltie of sacrilegiouse rebellion against God and his church. And the reason is manifested. For who soeuer exerciseth any office not in his owne, but in another mans name, and doth it without his warrant and commission, doth him manifest iniury, vsurping his authoritie (the most valued and esteemed right that any man enioyeth:) and if the thing attempted be of moment, and the partie whose authoritie is vsurped, be his soueraigne, as both happen in this case of preaching, and ministring Sacraments in the church, the vsurper and all his abettors, by the auow of all men, cannot be but guiltie of treason, and manifest rebellion. For fuller confirmation and declaration wherof (though manifest in it selfe, and not denied by the Protestants themselues) because it is a point of exceeding consequence, it will not be inconuenient, to bring one such testimonie of holy scripture, as may serue both for an instruction, and motiue to all sorts of men to abhorre such sacrilegious vsurpation. To which purpose the dreadfull iudgment which God executed vpon *Core* and his complices, is most proper. The story is written in the booke of Numbers, and in brief is this. *Core* being only a Leuite, and therfore could not by his office offer sacrifice, which belonged only to Priests to doe, murmured against *Aaron* the heigh priest, accusing him and *Moyses* to the people of tiranny, as if they tooke vnto themselues, the office of Priesthood, and debarred others from the same, whereas

Numbers cap. 16.

the

the whole nũber of Gods people was holy and fitto exerciſe that function, as well as they. To his ſeditious ſuggeſtion, harkened *Dathan* and *Abiron*, who were not ſo much as of the tribe of *Leui*, and drew with them many of the common people, whoſe ſacrilegious rebellion God ſpeedely and ſeuerely punished, for the perpetuall example of all others. For *Core* with 250. of his cõplices, preſuming (for triall of their right in the office of prieſthood) to offer incenſe with *Aaron*, were all conſumed with fire from heauen, and their cenſors by Gods ſpeciall appointmẽt, beaten into plates, and nayled vpon the Aultar, for a perpetuall memorie of Gods wrath vpon thoſe ſacrilegious rebelles, and for a warning that none ſhould dare to attempt the like after them: and thus perished the principall offendors. Their fauourers and abettors, *Dathan* and *Abiron* with their wiues, children, and whatſoeuer belonged vnto them, were ſwallowed vp by a hideous, and dreadfull opening of the earth vnder them, and they deſcending quicke into hell, receiued due punishment for their ſeditious coniuration. Neither did Gods iuſtice ceaſe thus; For the next day, the people murmuring againſt *Moyſes* and *Aaron*, as if they had ſlaine the innocẽt, and for this cauſe moueing a new ſeditiõ, God ſlew with fire from heauen 14000. and 700. of them, and Gods wrath was appeaſed by *Aarons* offering of incenſe. This hiſtorie ſo authentically recorded by the holie Ghoſt for our learning (as S. *Paul* ſaith of all the reſt that is written) abundantly Rom. 15. 4. sheweth how greeuous an offence it is before God, to vſurpe the office of his Prieſts, and to intrude vpon his church, exerciſing eccleſiaſticall functions without lawfull calling or commiſſion, or anie way to fauour or further the ſame. Of which enormious crime whether our new maſters of reformation, and their adherents, fauourers, and followers be not guiltie, will appeare by the proceſſe of this enſuing Treatiſe.

3. And it is to be obſerued, that if they haue no other meanes to cleare thẽſelues from the crime of *Core*, and his cõplices, but by diſclayming from hauing any power to offer ſacrifice, in the vſurpation wherof, his offence did conſiſt, they wil neuertheles, yea though they did not heretically erre in denying all ſuch power) infallibly be found guiltie of his offence. For *Core* offended by thruſting himſelf into eccleſiaſticall or ſpirituall office, whereunto he was not called, nor had any authoritie to practiſe it.

which if theſe men be proued alſo to do, they ſhall alſo be conuinced of the like crime in generall, though with ſome difference in the particuler. As he for example that vſurpeth the dominion or gouernment of one towne or city only againſt his ſoueraigne, is no leſſe truly a traytor and rebell, then he that vſurpeth the gouermēt of a whole prouince or countrie; though the rebellion of the one be greater, then that of the other.

French Catechiſme ſunday 45.

4. Secondly the Proteſtants do grant and acknowledge together with the Catholikes, that the office of preaching and miniſtring ſacraments is by Chriſt his inſtitution ſo neceſſary, that without it the church of God (the ordinarie courſe of prouidence already eſtabliſhed remayning) cannot be conſerued, and therfore that there muſt of neceſſitie be Paſtors ordayned in the ſame, for the lawfull exerciſe and practiſe of this office and charge.

This neceſſarilie followeth of the other, and is too cleere to be denyed.

5. Thirdly they alſo grant with the Catholiques, that none can haue the authoritie neceſſarily required to the lawfull exerciſe of the office of Paſtor in Gods church, vnles he receiue it from God, by our ſauiour Chriſt: *to whom is ginen all poiuer in heauen and earth*. And who ſendeth others to preach and miniſter ſacraments, as his father ſent him: and therfore can no man of his owne authoritie take vpon himſelf this charge. S. Paul ſaying expreſly, *that no man taketh vpon him this honour, but he that is called of God as Aaron*. Which is ſo certaine and infallible, that it is alſo true in our ſauiour Chriſt himſelf, *who*, (as the ſame Apoſtle in the ſame place ſaith) *did not glorifie himſelf that he might be made high prieſt, but he that ſpake vnto him thus: My ſonne art thou, this day I haue begotten thee*. Theſe principles being granted and acknowledged as euident truthes by the Proteſtants themſelues; that it may appeare whether their miniſters be true and lawfull paſtors or no, it remayneth to ſee, whether they haue receiued this power from our ſauiour Chriſt. For if they haue not, they will according to the former grounds granted by themſelues as certaine truthes, be found not only no true Paſtors, but theeues and robbers, with which names and titles, our Sauiour himſelf doth ſtile them, that enter into his sheepe-fold which is his church, not by his auctoritie, *who is the dore, but clime vp another way*. Where it is to *be obſerued*, that theſe too *things*: to wit, to haue true authoritie or calling; and to haue true and ſufficient proofe of

Math. 28. 18. Ioan. 20. 21. Hebr. 5. 5.

Ioan. 10. 1. 2.

the

the ſame, are not heere nicely or metaphiſically diſtinguished, but they are ſuppoſed to be all one, and for aſmuch as pertayneth to the queſtion in hand, it is all one not to haue any authoritie at all, and to haue no proofe or conſtat of it: and therfore he that cannot make it appeare by ſufficient proofe, that he hath a lawfull calling to the miniſterie of gods word, and ſacraments, is truly iudged to haue none at all. Hence forward therfore ſhalbe particulerly examined the proofes which the Proteſtants themſelues doe bring for their calling.

The third Chapter.

It is no ſufficient proofe of lawfull calling to the miniſters of Gods word and ſacraments, that any one be iudged either by himſelf, or other, or both, fit and able to exerciſe that charge and function.

1. IN this chapter (as likewiſe in thoſe that follow) is mention only made of preaching and miniſtring ſacraments, not becauſe theſe be the only functions belonging vnto the paſtors of Gods church, but becauſe theſe are graunted by all Proteſtants to belong to that office, and are ſufficient for the deciding of the preſent controuerſie, without inuoluing other queſtions, (of power to offer ſacrifice, to make lawes or canons,) not neceſſarie for this purpoſe. Which obſeruation made; for the reſolution of the queſtion propoſed, I ſuppoſe (as a thing ſo cleare and euident, as can neede no proofe) that there is ſome certaine meanes, wherby both Paſtors may ſo fully and ſufficiently proue their lawfull miſſion, that they to whom they are ſent, cannot iuſtly doubt therof; and alſo wherby Chriſtian people may be ſo aſſured of their canonicall calling, that they neede not ſtand in feare, to receiue a woolf or a theefe in ſteed of a Paſtor or Shepheard, at leaſt, forſomuch as belongeth to his calling or commiſſion. For if there were no ſuch aſſured meanes to know this, our ſauiour Chriſt ſhould haue ſmall reaſon ſo often to warne his people to beware of falſe prophets, woolues, theeues, and robbers. For how can

they beware of them, whom they haue no ſufficient meanes to know? And likewiſe how can the people of God auoide that dangerous hazard, of deſpiſing both our ſauiour Chriſt, and his eternall father; in deſpiſing thoſe whom he ſendeth, to whom he ſaith. *He that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth mee*? How can (I ſay) Chriſtian people auoide this danger, vnles there be ſome certaine and aſſured meane to know whom he ſendeth, and to diſcerne them from thoſe, that come of themſelues, being ſent by none. This preſuppoſed, the difficulty of this queſtion is not great.

Luc. 10. 16.

2. For euident and certayne it is, that albeit a man be iudged, neuer ſo fit and able to vndergo the charge and office of a Paſtor, he hath not for all that, that calling, cõmiſſion, and authority, which is neceſſarilie required, for the lawfull and auailable exerciſe of that function, the holy Ghoſt expreſly teaching that *none can preach vnleſſe they be ſent:* and that *none can take vpon them this office but ſuch as are called of God as Aaron was.* For the more eaſie vnderſtanding of the reaſon herof, it is to bee noted; That the lawfull and auailable exerciſe of any office, either ciuill or Eccleſiaſticall, is not like vnto the exerciſe of an arte or trade, which after a man hath learned, and is skilfull therin, he may lawfully vſe, (ſome certaine formalities, which ciuill policy hath brought in, in ſome places obſerued) yea if without the obſeruation of theſe formalities, he exerciſe his trade, that which he ſhall do, is not void, and of none effect, but is truly and auailablie done. As for example, if a carpenter, which is not free of *London*, ſhould build a houſe in *London*, he may, according to the ſtatutes of the citie, be amerced or fined, but yet the houſe, which he ſet vp, ſhall remayne a howſe. But it is otherwiſe in the exerciſe of any office, either Eccleſiaſticall or ciuill. For if one that is not appointed, and approued iudge for example; ſhould giue ſentence in any caſe either ciuill or criminall, his fact ſhould not only be vnlawfull, but vneffectuall yea none at all, though he ſhould giue a true ſentence. And this not for any other reaſon, but becauſe he wanteth the true authoritie of a iudge: the ſame reaſon holdeth equally at leaſt in the exerciſe of ſpirituall or eccleſiaſticall offices. And the true reaſon herof is, becauſe the skill, fitnes, or abilitie to exerciſe any office, whether ciuill or eccleſiaſticall is a farre different thing, from the power and authority, wherby the officer is authoriſed to exerciſe the ſame; that, being

Rom. 10. 15. Hebr. 5. 4.

or ought to be presupposed, this superadded. For the Prince, when he maketh any Officer or Magistrate, doth not make him fit for it, but finding or thinking him fit, giueth him authority and power to exercise it. A man being made fit for any office by nature, arte, industrie, or grace, is notwithstanding made Officer by the grant, patent, or appointment of him, who hath power to giue it. And therfore we see, that all that are iudged fit to beare office, either in the church or common-wealth, are not foorthwith Officers. The function therfore of preaching Gods word, and ministering Gods Sacraments, being not only an office, but the greatest in that kind, that euer was imparted to man, it doth necessarilie require authority, and power for the lawfull, and auailable exercise therof, without which no fitnesse, neither of nature, arte, nor grace (the ordinarie course of Gods prouidence and ordinance remaining) sufficing otherwaies to make it good and lawfull. And this is so euident both by scripture and reason, that it is not denyed of any, and *M. Mason* confirmeth it saying: *though a man were wiser then* Salomon *or* Daniel, *he must expect till our Lord send him; he that teacheth without a calling, how can he hope that Christ, will be with him?*

Mason pa 9. n here beside his diuers testimonies of holy scripture he citeth Beza for the same purpose.

The fourth Chapter.

That one iudged by himself or other fit for the ministring of Gods word and Sacraments; though such as are in office are supposed, not to discharge rightly their duties, cannot lawfully take vpon him that office, as sufficiently called therunto: neither is such a iudgment and opinion any sufficient calling.

1. THIS question is moued by reason of a peece of doctrine deliuered by that great Rabin of the falsly reformed Frēch church *M.r du Plessis* who seemeth to affirme, that any one without any speciall calling, may preach and teach, euery one hauing sufficiēt calling by his owne neale, and the want of others, to discharge rightly that office.

Treat: of the church cap. 12. after the beginning.

For firſt hauing shewed no ſmall diſdayne, that their miniſters should be demanded of their calling, he ſaith: *It is the ſame thing* (to ſay vnto their miniſters, whence come ye? who ſent ye?)
2. Paralip. 18. 23. *that Sedechias the falſe prophet ſaid vnto Micheas. By what way went the ſpirit of our lord from mee to ſpeake vnto thee? The Phariſees to our ſauiour*
Math. 13. 55. Marc. 6. 1. Act. 4 7. *Chriſt. Thou art a carpenters ſon, who ſent thee? The high prieſts to the Apoſtles. By what authority doe ye theſe things?* But theſe are teſtimonies againſt himſelf. For firſt there is no queſtion, nor mention of the calling of ordinary Paſtors, or Teachers in any of theſe places, as will eaſily appeare, to any one that shall ſee the places themſelues, and therfore are they impertinently alleadged. Secondly, Though the queſtion were there of the ordinary calling of Paſtors, and alſo that they were wrongfully demanded of their calling, (wherof notwithſtanding none of them complaine) yet the caſe betweene them, and our now reforming miniſters, is moſt different. For all theſe parties had already giuen ſuch euident proofe of their calling, that their aduerſaries could not deny it, which when theſe new preachers shall do, they shalbe no more examined of their calling: but till then let them not looke to be eſteemed any other then ſuch, as
Io. 10. 1. 2. our Sauiour ſaith, *Enter not by the dore, but clime vp another way, only to rob and ſteale.* Thirdly; *Monſieur du Pleſſis* doth make ſcripture of his owne, when he ſaith in the 2. quotation (*who ſent thee?* for there is no ſuch thing in the whole goſpell) *we might anſwere* (ſaith he, to wit to the queſtion of their calling) *in one word after our ſauiour Chriſt: The words that we preach, beare witnes of vs*: and citeth. Io. 8. But this saying of our ſauiour is neither in that place, nor any where els in the whole Bible, that I know. Our
Io. 5. 36. Sauiour ſaith thus indeed. *The very workes themſelues which I doe, giue teſtimonie of me, that the father hath ſent me.* And againe. *If you will*
Io. 10. 38. *not beleeue me, beleeue the workes*; Which rule being applied to the new reforming miniſtery (as our Sauiour ſpeaking of ſuch creaMath. 7 16. tures counſeleth) ſaying (*By their fruits shall ye know them*) will deſcry that they came from the ſame maſter, that the Arians and Donatiſts came from, their workes being altogither like. As pulling downe of Altars, ſpoyling of churches, vnuealing virgins, banishing, impriſoning, and diuerſly tormenting Ca*Epiſt. of the councell of Sardic in Theodo li. 2. cap. 8. cap. 15.* tholike Biſhops, Prieſts, and other profeſſours of the Catholike faith, not by eccleſiaſticall, but by ſecular and vſurped iudgment.

The

The Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtories are full of the *Arians* proceedings in this kinde, wherein our Proteſtants in thoſe places where they haue the temporall magiſtrate at their deuotion, doe farre ſurpaſſe them. And for the Donatiſts manners, this one teſtimony obiected by *D. Bishop*, and not reiected by *D. Abbot* ſhall ſerue our Proteſtants for a glaſſe to ſee themſelues in. *They ſet Churches on fire, caſt the moſt holy Sacrament of Chriſts body to brute beaſts, throw downe Altars, brake chalices, defiled holy oiles, made ſale of the holy ornaments of the Church: whoſe execrable facts ancient* Optatus *condemneth in theſe words. In this kinde haue ye procured as much damage to God, as you procured gaine to the diuell: you haue wickedly melted chalices, barbarouſly broken downe Alters, you haue vncouered the heads of Virgins, veiled in ſigne of their profeſſion, &c.* But let vs ſuppoſe that *Monſieur du Pleßu* Scripture is canonical, I would know of him, how he would refute the *Arians, Pelagians, Neſtorians, Anabaptiſts*, or any other heretikes whatſoeuer, who wil as readily and reſolutely ſay, *the words that we preach, beare witneſſe of vs*, as they of *Monſieur du Pleſſis* new reformed Church. For if this ſhort anſwer be ſufficient to ſtop the Papiſts mouthes, demanding proofe of the Proteſtants calling, (as *Monſieur du Pleſſis* ſaith) ſurely he muſt by the ſame rule haue his mouth ſtopt, and admit all thoſe for lawfull Preachers, who can giue the ſame anſwer, which all heretikes can as eaſily, and as truly doe as his Miniſters.

Sozomen. li. 7. cap. 13. & 14. Athanaſius, 2. & epiſt. ad ſolitariam vitam agentes.

D. Bishops reproofe. p. 42.

D. Abbot p. 87. Li. 6. cont. Parmenian.

2. *Beſides this* (ſaith Monſieur du Pleſſis of the Catholiques) *They alledge their long ſucceſſion, that they are the children of* Abraham, S. Peters *heires &c. To whom our Sauiour anſwereth for vs. I know you are* Abrahams *ſeede, but you are of your father the diuell. And* S. Paul: *Be not deceiued brethren. The ſonne of perdition ſhall ſit and be worshipped in the temple of God.*

Io. 8.

2. Theſ. 2.

We alleadge indeed our ſucceſſion from *S. Peter*, not to proue by it alone our lawfull calling, but by it alone to diſproue the calling of all thoſe, who haue it not: and to this purpoſe the argument is ſuch, as neuer can be anſwered, as heereafter will appeare more at large.

The teſtimonies of our Sauiour, and *S. Paul*, are as pertinently alleaged againſt vs, as they might haue beene by the *Arians* or any other heretiques, againſt the Catholiques that impugned their hereſie, and not otherwaies. But that I may refute his whole doctrine with better methode, then he deliuereth it, I will firſt ſet

down his concluſion, and then anſwereth his arguments, whereas he putteth moſt of his arguments before his concluſion, vſing therein more craft then good order: to wit, purpoſing by ſome ſleight and apparent reaſons, to bleare the eyes of his leſſe carefull Reader, in ſuch ſort as he may make leſſe difficulty to admit his concluſion, which is not only harsh but moſt abſurd thus ſet downe.

Rom. 10. 3. *Not to inuert order, for we know it is ſaid. How can they preach except they be ſent? But becauſe in a generall diſorder, men reſpect not alwaies the formalities of order, and alſo becauſe that to aduertiſe either the Church of neceſſary reformation, or a particuler perſon of his ſaluation, euery Chriſtian is ſufficiently grounded vpon a generall calling, by the zeale which he oweth to the ſeruice of God, and by the charity that bindeth him to his neighbour, reſerſing to the Church the examination by the word, whether he be well grounded there in or no.*

By this doctrine we ſee that all men, yea and women (for he ſpeaketh without reſtriction, *of all Chriſtians*, and if his examples ſerue for any thing, they prooue the ſame) haue a ſufficient calling to aduertiſe not only particuler perſons of their ſaluation, but the church it ſelfe of neceſſary reformation. Which large and wide ground is doubtleſſe laid of purpoſe; that if in caſe the new miniſters ſhall by force of plaine and euident argument, be thruſt out of all other ground of calling, as they know right well they ſhall, they may haue recourſe to this at laſt, thereby to maintaine their credit if it be poſſible. For if it were not for this end, no man endued with the leaſt dram of reaſon would euer haue vttered ſuch a propoſition, which firſt is directly contrary
Rom. 10. to the expreſſe doctrine of the Apoſtle ſaying. *How can they preach vnleſſe they be ſent?* which doctrine *Monſieur du Pleſsis* confeſſeth to know well, and therefore is guilty of greater iudgement, by contradicting it, according to that of our Sauiour Chriſt ſaying: *He*
Luc. 12. 47. *that knoweth the will of my Father, and doth it not, ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes.* What ſhall then become of him, that knowing it, doth voluntarily contradict it, as *Monſieur du Pleſsis* heere doth? He ſaith that this is not to inuert order, but only in a generall diſorder, not to reſpect the formalities of order. But *S. Paul* eſteemeth the ſending or miſſion of Preachers not a formality of order, but ſo neceſſary and eſſentiall a condition thereof, as without it none can preach, no more then others can heare without a Preacher.

or beleeue without hearing, all which *S. Paul* knitteth together in one forme of ſpeach. But belike *Monſieur du Pleſsis* thinketh it no diſorder to breake order, where he falſly preſumeth it is once broken already.

4. Secondly, it giueth liberty to euery wilfull, wrangling, and peruerſe ſpirit, to diſquiet and perturbe the peace of Gods Church, furniſhing euery one with power and authority to reforme the ſame. Which is the very true reaſon that there are as many new Reformers amongſt them, as there are diuers ſects of their reformation. And how many theſe are doth eaſily appeare, by the innumerable bookes written one againſt another. Whereof that the Reader may haue ſome little taſt, he may know that one Proteſtant author *Hoſpinian*, maketh mention of aboue two hundred bookes, written in the ſpace of ſeuenteene yeeres, by the brethren of the Reformation, one againſt another, in this one point only of the Euchariſt. Neither is there any poſſible meanes, to auoide this euident miſchiefe, the ground heere laide by *Mouſieur du Pleſsis* once admitted. For ſeeing *Luther* had ſufficient commiſſion by this generall calling (for other he had not, as ſhall be ſhewed hereafter) to reforme the Church of *Rome*, why ſhould not *Zuinglius* haue the like power, to reforme *Luthers* reformation; and *Caluin* that of *Zuinglius*, and ſo forward till they at laſt haue brought forth the moſt vgly brood of *Swenkfeldians*, *Arians*, *Libertines*, *Anabaptiſts*, and many other peſts of the Chriſtian world? It is fourteene hundred yeeres agoe that *Tertullian* obſerued this liberty of reformation in all heretiques in theſe words. *Let me be a lyer if they* (Heretiques) *differ not amongſt themſelues from their owne rules, whileſt euery one by his owne iudgement doth moliſie that which he receiued; as he who taught it him framed it of his owne braine. The progreſſe of the thing doth declare it ownenature and manner of beginning. The ſame thing was lawfull to the* Valentinians *that was lawfull to* Valentin *himſelfe: to the* Marcionites *that was lawfull to* Marcion. (And why not then to the *Lutherans* as well as to *Luther*,) *to innouat or change their faith and belieſſe as they thinke good.* And for this reaſon he ſaith there are ſeldome ſchiſmes amongſt heretiques: becauſe euery one maketh a ſect and a body by himſelfe.

Hoſpinia. hiſtoria Sacramentaria parte. 2.

De præſcrip. cap. 42.

Neither is the prouiſo which *Monſieur du Pleſsis* addeth, ſaying: (*that ſuch Reformers ought to reſerue, to the examination of the Church by the word, whether they be well grounded or no,*) ſufficient, to preuent

this manifeſt miſchiefe. Yea it is like, as if one ſhould let looſe a great number of rauening dogges, or woolues among the sheepe, but with this *caueat*, that they kill none, vnleſſe the Shepheard allow them to doe it. For let the world (which is already peſtered with ſo many and diuers ſects whereof one condemneth the other to hell fire for their hereſies) iudge, whether this *caueat* of *Monſieur du Pleſsis*, be not ouer weake a barre to ſtop from rage, the furious torrent of turbulent ſpirits, ſet once at liberty by the former doctrine, to reproue in one another, whatſoeuer their phantaſticall ſpirits ſhall diſlike, with the like freedome that *Luther* vndertooke to reproue the Catholike Roman Church. For I would know of this new doctour, whether he that vpon the warrant by him heere approued, doth aduertiſe the Church *of neceſſary reformation*, as he tearmeth it, ought ſo to referre himſelfe, to the iudgement of the Church, that it iudging his aduertiſment, to be the meere motion of an vnquiet ſpirit, inſpired by the father of al lies, ſedition, ſchiſme and falſity, ſhould be bound to ſubmit himſelfe thereunto, and to proceed no farther in his pretended reformation, vnder paine to incurre the cenſure, and penalty of a ſeditious rebell, or no? If he anſwere that he is bound ſo to doe, he ſhall giue ſentence, againſt all his reforming brethren, who haue not yeelded, to the iudgement of the church, condemning their doctrine for hereſie, by the ſame ſolemne manner of proceeding, to wit, by generall counſell, that she condemned *Arius*, *Sabellius*, *Macedonius*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutiches*, and all others, who by the iudgment of theſe Reformers, are, and haue beene lawfully condemned. Neither can it be ſaid, that this ſentence is not iuridical, being the ſentence not of any competent iudge, but only of the aduerſe party. For the ſame might the condemned heretikes before mentioned, haue anſwered for themſelues, and their doctrine. Secondly, when *Luther* (vpon this generall calling here mentioned, for other he had none) began his pretended reformation, there was not ſo much as one man in the world, of his opinion in all points of his doctrine, no nor he himſelfe at the beginning did hold all the hereſies he taught afterwards: much leſſe was there any church, which he would acknowledge for competent iudge of his propoſitions. And therefore was either to reſerue the tryal of his reformation, to the iudgment of the Catholike Roman Church, or to none at

all

all, and then *Monſieur du Pleſſis* his *caueat* is nothing worth.

If *Monſieur du Pleſsis* anſwer, that ſuch a Reformer is not bound to ſtand to the iudgement of the Church, but in caſe only, that it iudge according to the word: I will aske of him, who ſhall determine, whether the Church iudgeth according to the word or no? the church, or the pretended Reformer? if he ſay the church, he and his remaine condemned: if he ſay, the pretended Reformer, his *caueat* is no more then a very cobweb, to be blowne away with the ſmalleſt breath of euery one pretending reformation; who may with as good right challenge to reforme the Church of *Geneua*, after the example of *Seruetus*, as *Caluin* did that of *Ausburg*, and *Luther* that of *Rome*. So that the world ſhall neuer be free from new reformations, ſo long as there is a diuell in hell to inſpire the giddy ſpirits of reſtles, and rechles men, who are as willing and ready to run into ſedition, as he is to puſh them forward into it. For if *Monſieur du Pleſsis* or any other for him thinke to wind himſelfe out of this labyrinth by ſaying, that this muſt be determined, neither by the church, nor by the reformer, but by the word: he ſhall ſhew himſelfe too too impertinent. For why then doth he ſay that it muſt *be reſerued to the Church, to iudge according to the word, whether he be well grounded or no*? Secondly, ſeeing that in this caſe, the whole controuerſie is reduced to the word in ſuch ſort, as it is now only in diſpute, what the word doth teſtifie, it is all one to ſay, that this controuerſie ſhall be iudge of this controuerſie, (then which nothing can be imagined more abſurd) and to ſay, that the word ſhall be iudge of this controuerſie, for the controuerſie (as I ſuppoſed) is now, what the word doth iudge of the controuerſie in hand.

5. Thirdly, I would know of *Monſi. du Pleſsis*, what he will anſwer to the *Anabaptiſts*, *Libertines*, and *Arians* all obiecting corruption and hereſie in the Church of *Geneua* and *France*, and therefore grounded vpon that generall calling of zeale to Gods ſeruice, which he here approoueth, doe aduertiſe it of neceſſary reformation. If he ſay the Church (to wit of *Geneua*) doth condemne them and their reformation of hereſie, they will appeale from that ſentence, as from the ſentence not of any comperent iudge, but of their aduerſe party. If he betake himſelfe to the written word, they will contend with him, that the word doth wholly fauour them, and will at laſt inforce him to confeſſe theſe ſayings

Tertul. de præſcriptio. cap. 11. 18. 19.

of ancient *Tertullian* to be moſt true, though he will not eaſily grant them to vs alleadging them againſt him. *The contention by Scriptures* (againſt Heretiques) *profiteth nothing but either to turne the ſtomach or the braine.* Whereof he giueth this reaſon. *This hereſie receiueth not ſome Scriptures, and thoſe it receiueth it peruerteth by adding and detracting to make it ſerue his purpoſe. The falſe ſenſe no leſſe impugneth the truth then the corrupted text. Differing preſumptuous doctrines doe neceſſarily deny that, whereby they are conuinced, and doe relie vpon that which they haue falſly framed. What wilt thou gaine* (*moſt cunning ſcripturiſt?*) *whileſt what thou defendeſt, thy aduerſary denieth, and what thou denieſt he defendeth? Thou ſhalt indeed looſe nothing but thy voice by crying: nor ſhalt thou gaine any thing but choler by hearing blaſphemies. And he for whoſe confirmation thou entereſt into thy diſpute by Scriptures, ſhal he be more ſwayed to the truth or to hereſie? being moued by that he ſeeth thee to haue gained nothing, the aduerſe part being equall in defending and denying, doubtleſſe by this equall altercation he will depart more doubtfull, not knowing whether doctrine he may eſteeme to be hereſie. For this they* (Heretiques) *will ſay, that we corrupt the Scriptures and their interpretation, and therefore that they defend the truth. Therefore are not we to appeale to the Scriptures, nor is the controuerſie to be ſetled in them, in which the victory is vncertaine, or at leaſt not very certaine.* Thus far *Tertullian*, whoſe doctrine if *Monſieur du Pleſsis* will allow for currant (as he hath no reaſon to refuſe it) he muſt neceſſarily grant, that the triall of controuerſies by only Scripture is neither eaſie nor effectuall. But whatſoeuer he ſhall eſteeme of this teſtimony, yet ſhal he in fine be forced euen by his owne rule here ſet downe either to admit of their reformation, whom he condemneth, to wit, the Arians, Anabaptiſts, and Libertines, or confeſſe that his doctrine here deliuered, is moſt wicked and pernicious; as giuing liberty to all perſons vnder a falſe pretence of reformation to diſturbe the peace of Gods church at their owne pleaſure: which liberty were it to be practiſed in temporall gouernment, would quickly turne all vpſide downe in ſuch ſort, as could neuer be remedied. For if it were lawfull for euery ambitious and vnruly ſpirit, to ſuggeſt againſt the eſtabliſhed gouernment, and gouernors, what he liſt, vnder the colour of neceſſary reformation: and his ſuggeſtions being reiected by the ſoueraigne maieſtrates as ſeditious and wicked, might appeale from their ſentence, as parties and might caſt himſelfe vpon the triall of the law, and that to be vnderſtood no otherwaies then he will haue

it: what peace could be expected in ſuch a common-wealth? Which in conuenience in the ſpirituall or eccleſiaſticall gouernment of Gods church, is by ſo much more hurtfull and hatefull, then in the temporall gouernment of any common-wealth (but that men are leſſe carefull of thoſe things, that appertain to their eternall felicity then in thoſe that touch their temporall weale) by how much more domageable it is to looſe the inheritance of the kingdome of heauen, then to looſe ſome ſmall temporall eſtate in this world.

Hauing thus refuted this ſeditious doctrine of *Monſieur du Pleſsis*, (which doubtleſſe was firſt hatched there, where there is no order, but all horror and confuſion) I wil now examin his grounds whereupon it is built. But by the way I will aduertiſe thee (carefull Reader) that he bringeth nothing at all, for the eſtabliſhing of his doctrine, whereupon he groundeth this large commiſſion of calling: but ſuch ſtuffe as the Arians, Neſtorians, Pelagians, and all other condemned heretikes whatſoeuer might haue brought againſt the Catholike church, and which the Anabaptiſts and Libertines, (who *Monſieur du Pleſſis* eſteemeth heretikes) may alleadge for themſelues againſt him, which only obſeruation is more then ſufficient, to ouerturne all that he ſaith to this purpoſe. But let vs ſee the particulers. They conſiſt of ſimilitudes, and examples, which is the worſt, and weakeſt kind of argument of all other. For oftentimes they prooue nothing at all but only ſerue to explicate the matter in queſtion, and make it more eaſily vnderſtood: and that only when they are fitly applyed, as his are not.

6. *VVhen a fire* (ſaith he) *hath taken in a city, or the enimies ſcale the wals by night, if the meaneſt citizen giue the alarme, yea or a ſtranger, while the ſentinels are a ſleepe, they neuer aske him, by what commiſſion he did it; much leſſe doe they call him into queſtion for it, but they fetch water, and run to the wals, they ſee what the matter is, and euery one conneth him thankes for ſo good a warning. Contrariwiſe when we diſcouer Antichriſt ſiting in the Church, and take vpon vs, to confute him openly in the face of a Councel, and in his preſence, inſteed of hearing vs, of weighing our reaſons, of looking into the Scripture where he is ſo liuely painted, and by which we are to view him, they fall to examine vs of our qualities, and what Commiſſion we haue to giue warning of him, yea they put vs to death worſe, then if we had betrai'd the common-wealth.* Pleſſis p. 362.

Anſwer. Tertul de proſcriptio.

This queſtion, whence come yee? who ſent you? where is your warrant to preach? troubleth all Heretikes and was propoſed by *Tertullian* 1400. yeares agone to thoſe of his time.

Here is nothing in all this that *M.' du Pleſsis* ſaith which the afore mentioned condemned Heretikes, might not haue ſaid for their defence againſt the Catholikes, or the Anabaptiſts may not now ſay againſt the Caluiniſts, and therefore is all idle, and empty words. Whereas if he had made his compariſon, betweene the eccleſiaſticall, and temporall ſtate, or gouernment, his argument would haue had more shew of reaſon. But he ſaw well it was not for his purpoſe, but would haue made euidently againſt

abouen. 5. him, as appeareth by that which is noted therof, not farre aboue. For if he would apply his argument to the temporall gouernment, and gouernours, and proue thereby the like liberty and power, in euery one to reforme the ſame as he would doe in the eccleſiaſticall ſtate, I doubt not, but he would quickly be condemned for ſedition, and treaſon to his Prince, and country, and yet in any ſenſible mans iudgement, is there more probability, in that then in this. But let vs come more neere vnto him.

His *ſimile* faileth fowly in diuers reſpects. Firſt for that the pretended Reformers doe not diſcouer fire in the City, or the enimies ſcaling the Wals, but would gladly caſt and kindle fire, and ſcale the wals of Gods church: or if it be otherwaies, let them shew ſome euident difference, betwixt their entrie, or endeuour to enter, and of thoſe that they themſelues condemne for firebrands, and enemies of Gods church, which they can neuer doe.

Secondly, what man of ordinary ſenſe will ſay, that it is as eaſie a thing to diſcerne errour in doctrine of faith, or abuſe in the Church gouernment, as it is to diſcerne fire in the towne, or enemies ſcaling the wals, (which muſt be ſuppoſed for truth, or elſe this argument is nothing worth) ſeeing this is a matter of ſenſe, wherein none is deceiued, and that a matter of vnderſtanding and iudgement, wherein the wiſeſt, and greateſt clarkes haue erred, as witneſſe the laps of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, and *Lucifer*, to omit an infinite number of heretikes, who were not of meane vnderſtanding, if they had had grace withall?

Thirdly, this argument ſuppoſeth, that the watch of the Church may be ſo a ſleepe, that the enemies may ſurpriſe it, the watchmen

watchmen (that is, the Paſtors) being not aware thereof, which is directly againſt the Scripture, aſſuring vs the contrary. *Vpon thy wals Hieruſalem* (ſaith almighty God) *haue I placed a watch: night nor day ſhall they be ſilent for euer.* And our Sauiour himſelf, *I am with you for euer, euen to the conſummation of the world.* The diuell indeed may vpon the good ſeede, ſowne in the hearts of men, ſow cockle, that is, falſe doctrine, whiles the Paſtors ſleepe or neglect their office, as ſome expound the parable *Math.* 13. 24 but it no ſooner appeareth by externall word, or action, then the ordinary ſeruants of the maſter of the field, are ready to pull it vp, if he ſhould ſo thinke good, as followeth in the ſame parable, ſo that they neede not to beaduertiſed by ſuch, as haue no charge of that buſineſſe. Wherefore with all reaſon, are ſuch as come, pretending to aduertiſe the Church of neceſſary reformation, firſt examined whence they came, who ſent them, what commiſſion they haue? For our Sauiour Chriſt foreſeeing that falſe prophets would come in sheepes clothing (that is vnder the faire shew of reformation) whereas they are indeed rauening wolues, forewarned his ſpouſe the Church to take great heed of them: which warning she warily following, and withall knowing by S. *Paules* rule, *that none can preach, vnleſſe they be ſent*, doth rightly demand all new Preachers teſtimony of their miſſion, and calling. Which if they will neither shew, nor yet deſiſt from troubling the peace of Gods church: I referre it to any indifferent mans iudgement, whether they deſerue not, the reward of rebels to Chriſt, and his kingdome. And howſoeuer this ought to be is eaſily knowne, by the ſeuerity vſed againſt thoſe, that are found guilty of rebellion, and treaſon in any humane common-wealth only.

Eſay 62. 6. Math. 28. Math. 7. 15. Rom. 10.

And the more openly, or publikly, theſe pretending Reformers *doe take vpon them*, (theſe are his words) to impugne their ſoueraigne Paſtour, vnder pretence to diſcouer Antichriſt, the more impudent and leſſe tolerable is their rebellion. As in the like caſe, it would be in that ſubiect, that ſhould publikely impugne his Soueraigne Lord, vnder pretence to diſcouer a tyrant, or an vnlawfull vſurper. And if theſe zealous Reformers, had ſuch earneſt deſire to confute the Pope, (whom they heretically, and rebelliouſly call Antichriſt) openly in the face of a Councell, (as *Monſieur du Pleſsis* vainly brageth,) why did they it not when

Councell of Trent Seſſ 18 there was a Councell aſſembled, and they earneſtly inuited to it, with ſuch ſafe conduct as they deſired? But they haue as much will, or purpoſe, to come to any lawfull Counceil, as the *Arians* had, whoſe peruerſe proceedings not vnlike thoſe of our new Reformers, the Reader that hath deſire to ſee, may read part of them in the Epiſtle of the Councell of *Sardis* recorded by *S. Athanaſius* in his ſecond Apology, and by *Theodoret* before cited. *Monſieur du Pleſſis* proceedeth.

Pleſſis. 8. *If the Gouernours of places ſhould doe the like, when men giue them aduertiſments, what place is there, that would not ſoone be in the enemies hands? And what Prince would not iudge them traitours, and thinke they had intelligence with his enemies.*

Anſwere. He falſly ſuppoſeth, that men giuing aduertiſment of errour, or abuſe creeping into the Church, are either punished or examined of their commiſſion. But if this be true, whence commeth it, that there haue beene ſo many Councels Generall, Nationall, and Prouincial, holden in the Church of *Rome* from time to time? was it not vpō notice giuen, and taken, of errors and abuſes riſing in the church? And can *Monſi. du Pleſſis* bring any one inſtance, of any one punished or examined of his commiſsion for giuing ſuch aduertiſment? wel he may, of very many condemned, not for aduertiſing of errors, but for their obſtinate perſiſting in their errors, after canonical, and iuridical examination had of them. And of this number is he, and all his obſtinate adherents, whoſe aduertiſments haue been patiently heard, and their reaſons thoroughly weighed, and by lawfull authority iudged, to be repugnant to true faith, and therefore doe they moſt wrongfully complaine, as if they had not beene heard, nor their reaſons weighed. But they are greeued (and euer may they be) that the Paſtors and Rulers of Gods Church, *placed therein by the holy Ghoſt to gouerne it*, wil not ſuffer themſelues to be thruſt out of their charge, and the flocke of Chriſt, for which he hath shed his moſt pretious bloud, to be deliuered into the hands of robbers, and raueners. Of which ſort all ſuch are (by the infallible marke, which our Sauiour giueth of them) *that enter not into the Sheepe-fould by the doore*, (that is, by lawfull calling) *but clime vp by an other way*. See his example of a Gouernor forcibly retorted vpon himſelfe, in the next Paragraffe.

See the ſafe conduct grāted by the counſell of Trent to all heretiques. Seſſion 18.

Acts 20. 28.

Iohn 10. 1.

Pleſſis. 9 *The queſtion is not here of our qualities, but of the qualities of Antichriſt.*

christ, and of his doctrine: the matter toucheth the duty of those whom we aduertise, it concerneth the saluation both of them, and of those that rely vpon them, and of our selues also. If the aduertisment proue true, it is the safety of the Church: if it be found false, it commeth of our owne. The question is then for examining of the circumstances of the aduertisment, and not the quality of the aduertisers.

Here it wel appeareth, how gladly they would leape ouer the question of their calling, to that of doctrine; not because they haue more true ground, or aduantage in the one, then in the other, but because they haue more meanes to deceiue, and as it were cast dust into the eyes of such, as either are not able to discerne the true grounds of doctrine, or being desirous of nouelty (as an infinite number in these daies are) will not examine them, but vpon euery text of Scripture cited, (though in as bad sense and meaning, as that which the diuel cited to our Sauiour) thinke they haue ground enough, for their new doctrine, and gratefull error. Whereas in the question of calling or commission, they cannot easily deceiue any man, but such as are willing to be deceiued. For the proofes of calling being sensible, and as easie to be discerned, as the proofes of any commission in ciuill gouernment, there can be small meanes of deceit therein. It is not any new manner of proceeding, with such as attempt to bring new doctrine into the Church, to demand of them proofe of their calling, and commission. For ancient *Tertullian* vrgeth the Heretikes of his time in this sort; *What are ye, when, and whence came yee? what doe you in my Territory being none of mine?* It is false therefore that *Monsieur du Pleſsis* saith, that the question is not of their calling, or quality (if he will haue it so tearmed.) For the question between the Catholike Roman Church, and the pretended Reformers is both of their calling, and of their doctrine, but that of their calling is first of all to be decided, for the reasons before mentioned. VVhich also will more euidently appeare, by the example of a Gouernor of a place, vsed by himselfe, if the case be put a like. I will suppose therefore, for example sake, that one should come to *Saumeur* where he is Gouernour for his King, and should begin to command as Gouernour there telling the people that *Monsieur du Pleſsis* is an Vsurper the Kings sworne enemy, and that his gouernment is tyrannicall,

Answer.

Tertull. de praescriptio.

Cap. 1. n. 7.

and therefore is not to be obeyed, and that he himselfe is their true and lawfull gouernour, the Kings loyall, and faithfull seruant, and that he will gouerne them iustly, and according to the law: And being demanded by what authority or warrant he taketh vpon him the gouernment, and deposeth, or excludeth *Mouſieur du Pleßis*, who was placed there by lawfull authority, and hath beene so long in quiet possession of the same, should answer (as *Monſieur du Pleßis* doth heere) *that the question is not of his commission or quality, but of* Monsieur du Plessis *his quality, that the matter toucheth the duty of those; whom he aduertiseth: if the aduertiſment proue true, it is the safety of the place, whereof he is Gouernour, if it be found false, it only commeth from himselfe*. The case being thus put (as it doth most resemble *Mounſieur du Pleßis* doctrine and their proceedings against the Catholike church) I dare to appeale to his owne iudgement for triall therein; To wit, whether he should thinke himselfe iustly dealt withall in this case, and whether the people of *Saumeur*, could without euident rebellion to their Prince; and manifest iniury to him, receiue this new comer for their Gouernor, and thrust him out. This proceeding though it be in the sight of all men most manifestly vniust, seditious, and rebellious, yet will it appeare more wicked and peruerse, if we adde thereunto another circumstance, which they vse in their rebellion against the Church. That is, if *Monſieur du Pleßis* his aduersary, should not only refuse to shew any warrant, or commission, for vsurping his gouernment, but should farther enforce him to iustifie himselfe of those crimes, which he obiecteth against him, not before the Kings Lieutenant, because he is esteemed by him party or partiall, nor any other ordinary iudge, but by the words, and text of the law it selfe, and that not to be vnderstood in any other sense, then he (to wit, the vniust plaintiffe) will haue them to be vnderstood: I no waies doubt, but *Monſieur du Pleßis* would greeuously complaine of this proceeding, being most exorbitant, and vniust, as it is indeed. And if it were permitted in any ciuill gouernment, it would make, that no maiestrate should be two daies quiet in his charge, nor any country should euer enioy any peace. And hereby may the whole world see, how iust and honest, our new Reformers be, whose proceeding against their mother the Catholique church, is no other in true substance,

then is ſet downe in this caſe. For it is to be noted, that they neuer proceeded as accuſers, but as iudges, nor did they at any time propoſe, their matters by way of doubt, to be diſcuſſed and tried by canonicall triall which is not forbidden to any man to doe, but they abſolutly as ſoueraigne iudges, haue condemned the Church of falſity and error, and her Paſtors of Antichriſtian rebellion. And yet doe they thinke much to be demanded, by what power or commiſſion they doe it. Which manner of proceeding how peruerſe it is the former example doth ſufficiently declare. Which alſo proueth further, that though the Catholique Roman Church (by impoſſibility) ſhould be conuinced of error, and her Paſtors of rebellion againſt Chriſt, yet could not they (to wit, the reformiſts) be receiued for lawfull Paſtors, vntill they had made canonnicall proofe of their miſſion or calling. For as the conuicting of *Monſieur du Pleſsis* of treaſon, and intruſion would neither ſufficiently warrent his aduerſary, to take vpon him his gouernment without the Kings patents, nor the people to admit of him as their gouernor, though he ſhould prerend neuer ſo much fidelity, and equity in his charge, but if they ſhould doe it, they ſhould all be guilty of treaſon, and rebellion againſt their Prince. So neither can our new Reformers, nor thoſe that receiue them, be free from rebellion againſt Chriſt and his Church, if they ſhould without canonical proofe of their miſſion, take vpon them the charge of Paſtors: though the Catholique Roman church ſhould by impoſſibility (as is ſaid before) be conuinced of error, and her Paſtors of rebellion. And therefore howſoeuer the matter, in the queſtion of doctrine ſhould fall out with, or againſt our Reformiſts, yet is it manifeſt, that the queſtion of calling, is neceſſarily to be decided, before they may lawfully pretend, any charge ouer Chriſts flocke either in preaching or miniſtring Sacraments.

Though the Catholike Paſtors were proued vſurpers: yet would it not thence follow that the Reformiſts ſhould be true Paſtors.

10. *In the conſpiracy of* Cateline, *the Senate gaue eare to a baſe woman, againſt the greateſt men in Rome, VVhen the* Gaules *would by night ſurpriſe the Capitoll of Rome, the Sentinels ſpake not, the Dogs were dumbe, there was none but the Geeſe that cried, and yet euery one made account of it, and ran thither, whereby the City, which afterwards conquered all the world, was ſaued. VVherefore, if we were the vileſt and moſt contemptible of the Church, we deſerue (at leſt the hearing) eſpecially ſeeing we ſeeke not to ſpeake in the* Pleſſis.

eare, as backbiters doe, but in the face of the Church, and in their very eares whom we accuſe, and not from our ſelues, but from God by authority of his word.

Anſwer. But what is there here that *Seruetus* might not haue ſaid to *Caluin*, who cauſed him to be burned at *Geneua*, he himſelf deſeruing as well the fire? Or the Anabaptiſts, Familians, or Libertines, who are eſteemed by the other Reformed Churches damnable heretikes, may not alſo ſay for themſelues? They neither ſpeake in the eare as backbiters, when they cry for reformation, as appeareth by their many bookes written to that end, nor from themſelues, but from God by the warrant of his word, of the teſtimonies whereof their bookes are full. The ſame anſwere therefore that *Monſieur du Pleßis* or *Caluin* himſelf would make vnto theſe Reformers of their Church, (with that which hath beene ſaid aboue) ſhall ſerue for anſwer to his complaint heere made againſt the Catholike Church. And I appeale to the indifferent Reader, what peace or order were like to be either in the Church or Common wealth, if this licentious liberty of reformation, which he here inſinuateth, might vpon pretence or colour of the warrant of Gods word, be permitted to euery one?

Pleſſis. 11. *VVe read that Chriſt who was promiſed in the Iewiſh law, was reuealed by the Angell to the shepheards watching their flockes, and the shepheards publiſhed him among the people. Now after our Aduerſaries law, they ſhould haue beene ſet by the heeles.*

Anſwer. How beetle blind is hereſie, and wilfull obſtinacy? Becauſe the ſhepheards made relation of that which they had heard of the Angel, and ſeene with their eyes of our Sauiours birth, therfore would *Monſieur du Pleßis* inferre, that euery one hath power to preach, and are authoriſed to reforme the eſtabliſhed Church: As though it were all one for a man to make relation of a miraculous worke, which he hath ſeene or heard, to others, and to preach any doctrine, (eſpecially if it be new) with obligation on the hearers part to beleeue it, vnder paine of their damnation: who ſeeth not the abſurdity of this illation? That which he addeth of ſetting faſt by the heeles, is a childiſh taunt without either wit or weight. For the Catholique Church doth not impriſon any, but ſuch as after canonicall declaration, and deciſion, of their errour, doe obſtinatly perſiſt therein.

12. *Apollo also knew not but the baptisme of* Iohn, *and consequently could not haue any charge in the Church. And yet for all that, through feruencie of spirit, he goeth into the Sinagoge at Ephesus, and being mighty in the Scriptures, declareth the way of God, namely that Iesus was the Christ. The brethren of Ephesus, who were the Gouernours of Christs Church, so farre are they from putting him backe, that they commend his zeale, and exhort him to passe into Achaia, and writ to the Disciples that they should receiue him.* Plessis.

Answer. What he would inferre hereupon is euident, by his former discourse: to wit, that euery one should haue commission to preach, and reforme the Church. But this and that which *Apollo* did are as farre different, as it is for a Student at law, to pleade or dispute a cause, in the presence of others, with reasons and authorities for the proofe thereof; and for a iudge by authority to decide the same cause in publique court. Now who is there so sensleſſe as to say that he that may doe the first, may also doe the second? And who knoweth not, that the Catholique Roman Church, doth license Lay-men, that are knowne for learned, and grounded in piety, to dispute in controuersies of religion, either by word, or writing? who notwithstanding were neuer permitted to preach or minister sacraments. *Apollo* therefore did nothing, but that which the Catholique Church now alloweth in such men as he was, and therefore this instance is as impertinent, for *Monsieur du Plessis* his purpose, as the rest.

13. *Hereof we haue examples also in the Primitiue Church. In* Ædesius *and* Frumentius, *who being by some occasion carried into the Indies, doe there preach the word of God, and make Christian assemblies, being but meere Lay-men, for* Athanasius *did not lay hands on* Frumentius, *that he should there doe the office of a Bishop, till long after. In a poore woman slaue also, who instructeth the Queene of the Iberians in the knowledge of Christ, and a while after the king himselfe, teaching them so well as she could the seruice of God, and aduising them at last, to send to the Emperour Constantine for some Doctours.* Plessis.

Answer. But how fitly these two Histories make for his purpose, will appeare by the Histories themselues, whereof I will set downe the summe: the diligent Reader may see them at large in the author himselfe, if he please.

Ædesius and *Frumentius* being Christians and caried from Tire

Theodor. l. 1. c. 23. & 24. into the *Indies*, by their Vncle, to learne the knowledge of ſtrange countries, were by accident, (as God permitteth ſomtimes) retayned priſoners, all the reſt of their company being ſlaine by the Barbarous people. They were preſented to the King of the Country, who vnderſtanding their prudent behauiour, gaue them the charge of his houſe. He being dead, his ſonne had them in greater eſtimation. They hauing beene vertuouſly brought vp, did exhort the Marchants, that if any Romans, that is Chriſtians (as the cuſtome was) came thither, that they would meete together, and celebrate the holy rites. After long time they obtayned leaue of the King, to returne to their country, and *Ædeſius* remayned at *Tire*, but *Frumentius* preferring Gods ſeruice before the loue of his parents, went to *Alexandria*, and informed *S. Athanaſius* (who was then Bishop of that place) of the great deſire, the *Indians* had to be inſtructed, in the true knowledge of heauenly things. And *Athanaſius* thinking no man fitter for this religious employment, then *Frumentius* himſelfe, made him Bishop, and ſent him thither to preach, and inſtruct that Nation, which he did with happy ſucceſſe, God working by him great miracles, for the conuerſion of that people. And thus much of *Frumentius*.

About the ſame time was there a woman captiue amongſt the *Iberians*, who shewed them firſt the way of truth, she prayed continually, her bed was a little ſacke layed vpon the ground, and her diet was continuall faſting, shee being intreated by another woman, to cure her child which was ſicke, tooke it, and laid it in her little poore bed, and prayed to God, that it might be cured which was done. Which then being knowne, the Queene herſelfe being vexed with a ſore diſeaſe, went to the ſame poore captiue, and was cured by her in the ſame fashion, who in gratitude offered her great gifts, which shee refuſed, ſaying, she had no neede of none of them, but shee would thinke herſelfe highly recompenſed, if shee would vnderſtand the true piety, and withall as she could she inſtructed her in Gods commandements, and exhorted her to build a Church to the honor of Chriſt her Sauiour. Which the King not permitting for that time, was afterwards (by a new miracle done in his owne perſon) moued to conſent willingly vnto it. The Temple being therefore finished, but Prieſts wanting, the ſame captiue woman aduiſed the King and

Queene,

Queene, to send vnto the Emperour *Constantine*, to send them such, as might instruct them in true piety, and he sent them a vertuous, and learned Bishop with many gifts also. This is the summe of these Histories truely set downe, wherein there is not any word of preaching, or making Christian assemblies, by any of those parties, (as *Monsieur du Plessis* falsly affirmeth) nor of reforming a Church already established, but of making knowne either by way of miracle, or bare narration, the same points of Christian religion, to such as neuer had heard thereof before, which is allowed to be done by the Roman Church, in the same sort, as it was practised by these parties, and therefore these examples make nothing against the Catholike doctrine, or practise, yea they euidently confute *Monsieur du Plessis* his doctrine. For seeing none of these though indued with the grace of miracles, did or durst in that great, ye extreme necessity, vndertake the office and charge of Pastours without mission, or calling giuen by consecration, and imposition of hands: How can *Monsieur du Plessis* without blushing bring them, for the iustifying of this his no lesse seditious then new doctrine, *that euery Christian is sufficiently grounded vpon a generall calling, to aduertise the Church of a necessary reformation*; taking this aduertisment in that sense and sort, that they would practise it: that is, to iudge absolutely of the doctrine of the Church, reiecting that which they dislike, and establishing that which they approue.

But to what purpose shall we thinke, bringeth he the example of this good woman? to proue that women may preach? Surely if it proue any thing for him, it proueth that: which notwithstanding *S. Paul* expresly condemneth, *forbidding women to open their mouthes in the Church*. So that *Monsieur du Plessis* hath gained as much by this example, as those old, wicked, and corrupt caitifes gayned by accusing the chast *Susanna*, that is, his owne condemnation, bearing as euident witnesse against himselfe, as they did. For this holy woman so farre as she did cooperat to the making known of Christianity to those Pagans, which was not by preaching in publique assemblies, and congregations, or by exercising any other Ecclesiasticall function (as is manifest by the History) but by fasting, prayer, austere life, and euident miracle. Which sorts of proofe, being iustly exacted of our new Reformists, as well for their calling, as their doctrine (either being as truely new and vn-

1. Cor. 14. 34.
1. Tim. 2. 12.

couth in the Church of Christ, as Christianity was to those Pagans) yet haue they neuer shewed halfe so much, in either kind of proofe before mentioned, as this poore woman did: though she pretended not to be either Elder, superintendent, or Deacon in the church, as our new fellowes proclaim themselues to be, and desire to be esteemed so of others. Rightly therfore doth *M. du Plesis* bring this example, in condemnation of himself, as the wretched accusers of *Susanna*, did their testimonies against her.

Plessis. *I say all this in a time, when the Christian church had al her formes and rites.*

Answer. What Sir, had the Christian church al her formes and rites then in the Indies and amongst the Iberians, of whom only mention is here? what affected blindnes is this, or malicious desire to deceiue others?

Plessis. *Now it could not be, but they preaching the true God, and saluation by Iesus Christ, must needes abhorre idols, and consequently incurre perill of their liues, from which the exception of our aduersaries would haue quit them, they hauing no neede to put themselues so far into danger, hauing no calling in the church.*

Answer. He often but falsly, and fraudulently inculcateth the preaching of those parties, whereas they preached no otherwaies, then by their life and example, and as occasion was offered, by testifying their owne beliefe, and religion, not by authority as Pastors and Doctors, but by simple narration, which no man can doubt, but to be allowed and commended in the Catholik Romon church, as is before mentioned. And that they might, and did incurre danger of their liues, by abstayning from idolatry, and professing against it no man doubteth, but what may be inferred therby for his purpose I know not.

Plessis. *But zeale and charity taught them, that they were bound to doe it, and that the exception could not secure them from the account, which they were to make of their talent.*

Answer. Not only zeale and charity, but also duty and religion taught them that they were bound to abstaine from idolatry, and thereby to professe Christian religion, not in respect of any talent, whereof they were to giue an account (if he speak not vnproperly a talent in proper speach being that which is superadded to the substance of our faith) but in respect of their faith it self, which they were bound not to deny, nor forsake. As it happeneth with all Catholiques at this time in England, who are bound with hazard of their liues, not to deny the Catholique Roman faith, though they haue neither pow-

power, nor obligation to preach.

The ſame ſay we of the reuealing of Antichriſt. That queſtionles euery Chriſtian is bound to reueal him to the Church, whē God hath made him knowne to him. That we muſt not ſtand vpon theſe preciſe points of formality, and ſo much the leſſe for that hauing gotten poſſeſſion of the Church, it is to be preſumed he hath inuerted all order. Pleſſis.

When *Monſi. du Pleſsis* maketh anſwer to the Arians, Anabaptiſts, Libertines, and others, obiecting the ſame, againſt their new reformed church, he wil find this vain cōcluſion of all his ſeditious doctrine fully ſatisfied. Wherunto I wil remit him, not doubting but his owne conceit will beſt pleaſe him. Yet would I haue the (careful Reader) to mark how he eſteemeth the ordinance of the holy Ghoſt ſo expreſly teſtified by *S. Paul, that none can preach vnleſſe they be ſent*, to be but a preciſe point of formality. Are theſe they that make ſuch shew of the reſpect they beare to Gods word? Anſwer. Rom. 10.

And here will I make an end with M. *du Pleſsis*, for as much as pertayneth to this point. He adeth indeed three, or foure teſtimonies out of *Gerſon, Picus, & Aliacus*, which make nothing to the purpoſe for this preſent queſtion, and eſpecially the two latter, and as for the other (though his teſtimonies were direct againſt vs as they are not, being rightly cited and vnderſtood) yet becauſe he is knowne to haue ſaid many things, which were neither approued thē, nor ſince, his ſole authority can in equity weigh little againſt vs. And here once more (good Reader obſerue) that nothing hitherto hath been ſaid, nor hereafter can be ſaid, for the calling of theſe new Goſpellers, which may not be ſaid in the behalf of any heretiks whatſoeuer, new or old: yea which they, whō M. *du Pleſsis* here impugneth, may not ſay againſt him, if they were of any moment. And therfore though we ſhould grant him al his argumēts, yet ſhould he gaine nothing thereby, they hauing as much force, being vſed by vs againſt him, as he wold they ſhould haue againſt vs. And this thou ſhalt eaſly ſee, if thou wilt take the paines to apply them one by one, for the Catholike church againſt that of Geneua. But the truth is, they are of no force, neither for the one nor the other.

16. Hauing thus far refuted the reaſons of *Monſi. du Pleſsis* wherby he would proue, *that euery Chriſtiā hath ſufficient calling, to aduertiſe the church of neceſſary reformation* not only by way of informatiō (for that is not in controuerſie) but alſo by way of abſolut iudgement

and condemnation, which is the plaine drift of his discourse, and the practise of all the pretending Reformers it remayneth to proue the contrary, and withall to satisfie the question proposed in this Chapter.

Conclusion. It is no sufficient calling to the ministery of Gods word and sacraments, that any man be iudged either by himselfe, or others fit to exercise that charge: and that those who are in that office, are iudged not to performe their duty therein. And therefore if any one vpon these grounds take vpon him that office, what disorder soeuer he shall suppose to be already in the Church, he committeth sacrilegious rebellion against Christ and his church. I wil not stand long vpon the proofe hereof, because it is euident to all those that know and beleeue the scriptures. And were it not that *Monsieur du Plessis* in his doctrine already refuted, did not euidently insinuat the contrary, yea and expresly teach it in these words. *Although some of our men in such a corrupt state of the Church, as we haue seene in our time, without waiting for calling or allowance of them, who vnder the title of Pastours oppressed the Lords flocke, did at first preach without this formall calling, and afterwards were chosen, and called to the holy ministery by the church, which they had taught, to the which they had vowed their seruice and ministery: yet this ought to seeme no more strange, then if in a free Common-wealth, the people without waiting for the consent, or for the voices of those, that tyrannize ouer them; should according to the lawes make choice of good, and wise magistrates.* Were it not I say for this doctrine of *Monsieur du Plessis*, wherein as we see, he expresly approueth, the preaching of some of their men (he might haue said all, or at least all their first runners) without formall calling, only vpon the opinion, that those who were in the Pastors places, did not rightly discharge their duties, I should haue supposed this conclusion (which is so cleerely expressed in holy Scripture) to haue beene so euident, that it needed not any proofe. But seeing we must proue a thing so euident: First *S. Paul* saith, *that no man taketh vpon him selfe the honour* (of Priest-hood) *but he that is called of God as Aaron.* And farther he addeth, *that Christ did not glorifie himselfe, that he might be made high-priest: but he that said vnto him. My sonne art thou, I this day haue begotten thee.* As also in another place he saith. *Thou art Priest for euer, according to the order of* Melchisedech. And our Sauiour doth often testifie, *that he came not of himselfe, or in his owne name, but being sent by his heauenly Father. That he spake not of himselfe, but*

Treatise of the Church. pag. 371.

Heb. 5. 4. 5. 6.

Io. 5. 42. c. 7. 28. c. 8. 28. 38. Io. c. 14 31.

which he learned of his Father: and that as his Father commanded him, ſo he did. Now if the ſonne of God came not, without being ſent, nor preached not but that, which he heard, nor did not but that which he was commanded, (and that in a time, when there was greateſt neceſſity of reformation) who is he that can lawfully doe any of theſe things of himſelfe, though he pretend neuer ſo great diſorder in the Church, or neceſſity of Reformation?

17. Secondly *S. Paul* ſaith *How can they preach, vnleſſe they be ſent?* the hereticall euaſion and declyning of which words is before vrged againſt *Monſieur du Pleſsis*, tearming it *a formality of order, not neceſſary to be obſerued, in a generall diſorder*: ſuch is the peruerſity of theſe new maſters, who pretending to reforme the Church by the word are not aſhamed, nor afraid, to contradict the plaine words, and ſenſe of the holy Ghoſt, hauing no other meanes to maintaine there falcities by. Rom. 10.

Thirdly, the ſame Apoſtle in another place, ſetting downe the order eſtabliſhed by our Sauiour in his Church ſaith: *Are all Apoſtles? are all Prophets? are all Doctours?* ſhewing manifeſtly, that none are ſuch, but thoſe that our Sauiour ordeyned, or conſtituted ſuch, hauing imediatly before ſaid, *Some God hath ſet in his Church firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets, thirdly Doctours, &c.* But *Monſieur du Pleſsis* more liberall in gifts, then God himſelfe, will haue all Chriſtians, Doctors, to teach the Church, *and aduertiſe it of neceſſary reformation*, and that (as I haue noted before) not by way of information, but by abſolute iudgement, and ſentence. This is one of the great maſters of reformation, that breatheth nothing forſooth but the word, which notwithſtanding the diuell himſelfe could not without blushing, or trembling abuſe ſo euidently as he doth. Pardon me Reader, if thou thinke me to exceed, for I cannot ſupport theſe hippocritical peſts of mens ſoules, that pretending the purity of the word, doe thruſt vpon the ſimpler ſort, their owne phantaſticall inuentions, inſteed of Gods word and truth. 1. Cor. 12. 28.

18. Fourthly, our Sauiour himſelfe giueth vs this rule, to diſcerne true Paſtors, from vſurpers, and intruders, ſaying. *Amen, Amen, I ſay vnto you, he that entereth not by the doore into the fold of the ſheep, but climbeth vp another way, he is a theefe and a robber: but he that entereth by the doore, is the Paſtor of the ſheepe.* Now who can more manifeſtly climbe vp another way into the ſheep-fold, then they that Ioh. 10. 1. 2

come of themselues, to preach, and minister the sacraments, being sent by none? especially seeing so many heretikes are confessed to haue come, vnder the same faire pretence of reforming the church and purging it from the corruption of false doctrine, that our new Reformers also vse as a sheeps skin, to couer their wolvish hearts. *Beza* cited by M. *Mason* saith, *it is an order appointed in the Church by the Sonne of God, and obserued in all the Prophets and Apostles, that no man may teach vnlesse he be called.*

Mason p. 9.

19. The second part of the foresaid conclusion, to wit, that if any one vpon the afore mentioned grounds shal take vpon him, without being sent, the ministring of Gods word and sacraments (what disorder soeuer he shall suppose to be already in the church) shall commit sacrilegious rebellion against Christ, and his church, and all those that wittingly fauour, follow, or adhere vnto them, are also guilty of the same crime in their degree, is proued by diuers dreadfulexamples of Gods wrath, and indignation, shewed against such, as haue presumptuously thrust themselues into Ecclesiasticall functions, without calling or commission. Which, if our new masters in reformation, were as sincere searchers, and followers of Scriptures, as they pretend to be, would make them to be well assured of their calling, and commission, before they tooke vpon them that charge, which they so boldly chalenge to themselues: The only example of *Core* and his complices related before with that dreadfull sentence of *S. Iude: wo be to them that haue perished in the contradiction of* Core, as all they must needes follow his example, in vsurping the offices of the church without calling. Surely if there were no other example in the whole Scripture this alone would abundantly testifie this truth. Notwithstanding I will adde here some others of the like nature.

Cap. 2. n. 2.

1. Reg. c. 13. 1. 3. 14. *Saul* was reiected by God, and his posterity excluded, from being Kings ouer the Israelites, for once offering sacrifice, and that in a time when he thought himselfe pressed therunto by necessitie. In which case *M. du Plessis* likely would haue iustified his fact, saying that in such cases *formality of order is not to be obserued.*

2. Reg. c. 6. 7 *Oza* was stricken dead by God, for only putting his hand to hold vp the Arke, (which he thought was in danger to fall) In which case by all likelihod *Mons. du Plessis* would haue dispensed with him, seeing hee alloweth *their men in such a corrupt time*

as we haue ſeene in the Church, to preach at firſt without calling.

King *Oziu.* was ſtriken with a leproſie, and continued leper all his life time, for attempting to offer incenſe, and not deſiſting from his attempt at the admonition of the high Prieſt *Azarias*, who told him, that that office pertayned not to him, but only to the ſonnes of *Aaron*, whom God had conſecrated to that miniſtery. Here indeed was no neceſſity preſſing to doe this, whereby *Mnoſieur du Pleſſu* is wont to couer, and excuſe the ſacrilegious intruſion of his reforming miniſters. But neither doth the high Prieſt alleage that as a reaſon, why he ſhould deſiſt from his attempt, but directly telleth him that it is not his office, but the office of ſuch only, as God hath appointed for that miniſtery. 2. *Paralipo.* 26.18.19.

Hereunto alſo may be added the indignation of God, againſt the falſe Prieſts of *Ieroboam*, who that wicked King by his power, and not by Gods ordinance raiſed, to ſerue an Altar erected by himſelfe, againſt that which God had commanded, and to withdraw the people from frequenting the true church, and his true worship in Hieruſalem. To whoſe moſt wicked and ſacrilegious fact (to note this by the way) the new faſhion of ordayning Prieſts and Bishops inuented in King *Edwards* time, and continued euer ſince, is moſt like: as well for the manner of their ordering, to wit, only by the Kings inſtitution, without example or warrant either in Scripture or antiquity, as alſo for the end of their ordering, which was to withdraw the people from the frequenting the true Catholique Roman church, and Gods true worship, and religion obſerued therein. 3. Reg. c. 12. & 13.

Ann. 1. Ed 6. was an act made that Bishops ſhold be made by the Kings letters patents and not by election of Dean and Chapter as ſaith Rafal in his abridgment. And therefore in the beginning of Q. Elizab. Bishops writhe. n. virtute literarū patentium Domine Regina.

20 To thoſe authorities of holy ſcripture, I will adde only one cleare, and manifeſt reaſon, for the confirmation of the whole concluſion before ſet downe.

Nothing can be more euident in ciuill gouernment, then that he, that being ſubiect, or vaſſall to any Soueraigne, taketh vpon himſelf any office, charge, or miniſtery ouer his ſubiects without his warrant or commiſſion, doth thereby vſurpe his Soueraignes authority, and conſequently committeth manifeſt rebellion: if his vſurpation be in matters pertayning to command or gouernmēt, as it is in our caſe. For no act of rebellio can be more manifeſt, thē that wherby the ſubiect equalleth himſelf with his Soueraign (therby impeching his ſoueraignty, & withdrawing frō him his due ſubiectiō) which was the crime of *Lucifer*, the firſt, & father

of

of all rebels, saying. *I will ascend aboue the topp of the clouds, I will be like*
Isa. 14. v. 14. *the highest*. But by no other meanes, can any subiect more equalise himselfe with his Soueraigne, then by taking vpon him that power and authority, which is proper to his soueraigne: one great part whereof consisteth in ordayning magistrates, and officers in his dominions, who, euery one in their degree represent himselfe, exercising their offices not in their owne names, or by their owne power, but in his. He therefore that without his soueraignes appointment, or order, maketh himselfe officer in any charge ouer his subiects, doth manifestly vsurpe his authority, and therein doth equallise himselfe with him, and with-draweth frō him his seruice and subiectiō, which is a direct act of rebelliō.

Farther it is also euident, that not only he, that doth this, is guilty of rebellion, but all those that consent and concurre with him in the same act: in which manner transgressed all the other apostate Angels, that fell from heauen with *Lucifer*. As also the complices of *Core*, as is mentioned before. And of this *S. Paul* giueth a generall rule, saying. *Not only those that doe wickedly are worthy*
Rom. 1. 12. *of punishment, but also those that consent vnto them*.

This being manifest on the one side, and it being also clearly proued on the other, that such as haue no other calling, to the ministery of Gods word and Sacraments, but an opinion that they are fit for that office, and that such as are already employed therein, doe not rightly performe their duty in discharge thereof, haue no sufficient calling, or warrant from Christ, (he neuer, either by himselfe, his Apostles, or his Church, warranting any such vsurpation, yea expresly condemneth the same, as appeareth by the testimonies before alleaged) it must needes follow, that such, as vpon the now mentioned grounds, take vpon them the charge of Pastors of Christs flocke, are rebels against him, as be-
Math. 28. ing soueraigne ouer his Church, and *to whō all power in heauen, and in earth is giuen*. And not only they that doe this, are rebels against Christ, and his Church, but also all that fauour, follow, and adhere vnto them in the same fact. Whether our new Gospellers, and their adherents be of this number, or no, wil appeare hereafter. For if they be proued to haue, no other true calling, but that which is here mentioned, and already disproued, they are euidently conuinced, of the hatefull crime of rebellion against Christ, and his church.

The fifth Chapter.

That the truth of doctrine is not a sufficient proofe of true and lawfull calling, to the ministery of Gods word, and sacraments. Nor is it any assured meanes for a Preacher and Pastor, to proue himselfe authentically called to that charge, for him to alleage that the doctrine which he teacheth is good and true.

1. HAVING proued in the precedent chapter, that the sole opinion of the fitnesse of any person, to exercise the ministery of Gods word, and sacraments, ioyned also with an opinion, that such as are in that charge, doe not rightly discharge it, is no sufficient warrant for any man, to take vpon him selfe that office, it followeth, that we examine whether euery one, that pretendeth, to teach true doctrine, hath true and lawfull calling, to the ministery of Gods word. And the sense of the question is: whether they, that should haue no other proofe of their calling, to the ministery of Gods word and sacraments in his church, then that which is drawne from the nature, and quality of their doctrine, and manner of ministring the sacraments, in this sort: *The doctrine which we preach, and maner of ministring the sacraments, which we vse, is true and conformable to Gods written word: therefore our calling to preach, and minister the sacraments, is lawfully, and sufficiently warranted.* The question here (I say) is, whether this be a sufficient proofe of calling, to the lawfull ministery of Gods word and sacraments.

2. For the clearing whereof it is to be obserued, that two conditions are necessarily required in that whereby another thing is to be proued. The first is, that it be better knowne or more euident, then that which is to be proued by it. For it is an euident absurdity to proue one thing vnknowne, by another thing, that is as little, or lesse knowne. As for example, if one should proue the starres in the firmament, to be euen or of equal number, because they are not odde: or if one should proue

himselfe no bastard, because he is borne in lawfull wedlocke, the latter being no better knowne then the former, which should be proued by it: or (which is more to our purpose) if one should proue himselfe to be a lawfull iudge or iustice, because he iudgeth all causes according to equity and iustice; I say, that these, and all other such like proofes whereby we would proue the matter, which is in doubt and in question being as little or lesse certaine then that, which we would proue by them, are euidently absurd, and of no force. For in this case, that which should be proued, is made no better knowne, nor no more certaine, then it was before.

The second condition required in that thing, which is to be the proofe of another, is, that it be alwaies certainly, and infallibly ioyned with that, which is to be proued, (if we speake of certaine, and infallible proofes, as here we doe): for though one thing should be more euident, and better knowne then another, yet vnlesse it be found alwaies ioyned with the other, it cannot make any certaine, and infallible proofe of it. For example, it is more euident to him, that seeth a tree blossomed, that it is blossomed, then that it will beare fruit: and that a man, whom we see moue, doth verily moue, then that he doth ride on horsbacke, and yet neither is that an infallible and certaine proofe, that the tree blossomed, will bring fruit: nor this, that the man which moueth, doth ride on horsbacke, because neither the one, nor the other, is alwaies certainely ioyned with that, which should be proued. This being obserued.

Conclusion. 3. It is euident, that it cannot be any conuenient, or sufficient proofe of lawfull calling, to the ministery of Gods word, and sacraments, to alledge or affirme, that the parties, whose calling is in dispute, as doubtfull and vncertaine, doe teach true doctrine, and minister rightly the sacraments. And the reason is easie; because in this proofe, is neither of the conditions, which are required in a sufficient proofe, much lesse are they both, and therefore is it not only insufficient but very idle and absurd. But let vs see, how neither of those conditions is found in this proofe.

First it is no lesse vncertaine and vnknowne, that the doc-

ſtrine preached by any new maſter is true, and conformable to the holy Scriptures, then that his calling, who preacheth it, is good and lawfull: yea vnles it be the ſame doctrine, with that of the whole Catholique Church, (as if it be new, it cannot be) it muſt needs be farre more vncertaine, and more difficult to know, then is his calling, and therefore can be no ſufficient proofe thereof. For whether the proofe of doctrine conſiſt in the conformity, with the true ſenſe and meaning of the written word only, as the Proteſtants teach, or of the vnwritten, and written word together, as the Catholiques beleeue, euident it is, that the proofes of doctrin, drawne from thence muſt needs be farre more difficult, then are thoſe of calling becauſe the difficultie, in finding out the true ſenſe of holy ſcripture, is farre greater, then that, which is in trying out the true calling of any Paſtor; as euidently appeareth, aswell by the confeſſion, and example of the greateſt wits, that euer haue beene in the Chriſtian world; ſome willingly confeſſing great difficulty, in finding out the true ſenſe, and meaning of the holy Scripture: *S. Auguſtine* the Eagle of the Latine Church, with admiration confeſſing the profoundneſſe of Gods word, breaketh forth into theſe words. *O wonderfull profoundneſſe of thy words: wonderfull profoundneſſe (my God) wonderfull profoundneſſe, it maketh a man quake to looke on it: to quake for reuerence, and to tremble for the loue thereof.* And in another place, the ſame holy Doctor ſaith: *that for no other cauſe, are hereſies made but becauſe men not rightly vnderſtanding the ſcriptures, doe obſtinatly affirme their owne opinions, againſt the truth of them*: others of as great vnderſtanding peraduenture as he, but leſſe humility, haue euidently erred from the true ſenſe, and meaning of the Scriptures, as witneſſe the laps and errors of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Lucifer*, with many others: as alſo by the euident teſtimony of the ſcripture it ſelfe. *How can I vnderſtand the things, which I read,* (ſaith the religious Eunuch) *vnleſſe ſome man ſhew me?* *S. Peter* alſo ſaith; *that in the Epiſtles of S. Paul are certaine things hard to be vnderſtood, which the vnlearned and vnſtable deprane, as alſo the reſt of the ſcriptures, to their owne perdition.* Which difficulty our Sauiour Chriſt well knew, and therefore for remedie thereof, *he opened the vnderſtanding of his apoſtles, that they might vnderſtand the ſcriptures.*

Confeſſ. l. 12. c. 14.

De Gen. ad lit. c. 9. l. 2.

Act. 8. 31.

2. Pet. 3. 16.

Luc. 24. 25.

4. Neither doth the answer, which the Protestants vse to make to this, any way satisfie, saying; that though there be many hard passages in holy scripture, yet are they either explained in other places more easie, or else they doe not containe any other points of doctrine necessary to be knowne, then those that are contayned in the more easie places: This answere (I say) doth no way satisfie. For besides that euery place of scripture contayneth *doctrine profitable to teach, to argue, to correct, to instruct in* 2. ad Timo. 3. 16. *iustice*, as S. *Paul* teacheth, (and therefore not only the easie, but the hard places also): the many expositions giuen by the Protestants, contrary to the vnderstanding not only of the Catholikes, but also of other Protestants, vpon diuers places of scripture, containing chief points of faith, as for example of these words: Math. 26. *This is my body*: to omit the misunderstanding of holy Scriptures, by all former heretikes: (the true cause of all heresies, as S. Augustine saith) doe euidently shew the great difficulty, in finding out the true sense, and meaning of Scriptures, euen in places containing points of doctrine necessary to be knowne and beleeued, and therefore this their answer is both false and friuolous. And though S. Augustine saith, *that nothing almost is drawne* *De doctrina Christiana li. 2. c. 6.* *out of those obscurities, which may not be found in other places vttered plainly*: yet is neither his saying vniuersall, as is euident by that word (almost) neither is his meaning such, as that without the interpretation of the Church, all the plainer places of scripture may be easily vnderstood: As the variety of interpretations opposite to the true meaning of the Scripture, and therefore causing heresies as the same S. *Augustine* saith, doth euidently conuince. And thus much of the difficulty of finding out the true sense of Gods words, from whence the proofe of doctrine is to be had. It remayneth, that we now see, what difficulty there is in finding out the proofe of true and lawful calling, that afterwards it may appeare, whether the truth of doctrine, may be a conuenient proofe of calling, or no.

5. In the proofe of calling there is neither other difficulty nor mistery, then that he, that pretendeth to be lawfull Pastor, Preacher, or minister of Gods word, and sacraments, doe produce some authenticall instrument, or testimony witnessing, that he is put in that charge by him, that is confessed to haue authority to giue it. That this is the only knowne, and common way

of making proofe, of the ordinary calling to the miniſtery, there is none of the Proteſtants, that deny it. I ſay of the ordinary calling, for of that only I ſpeake here, leauing the extraordinary to another place. This being ſo, no man of any iudgement will ſay, that it is a more plaine, and eaſie thing to know, what doctrine is conformable to the true ſenſe and meaning of the Scripture; then to know, who hath lawfull calling of the miniſtery of Gods word and ſacraments: but the quite contrary: and therfore that the allegation of the truth of Doctrine, or the conformity thereof with the word of God, cannot be any competent or conuenient proofe of lawfull calling, according to the grounds propoſed, in the beginning of the Chapter.

6. And this is manifeſt by this cleare example. No ciuill magiſtrate, and in particuler, no iudge or iuſtice, was yet euer found ſo extrauagant, as to proue himſelfe true and lawfull iudge, by the right, and iuſt deciding of cauſes: But before any man can or dare to take vpon him to ſit in iudgement, as a publique iuſtice, vpon any matter, be it ciuill or criminall, he produceth his patent, or warrant, whereby it authentically appeareth, that he is eſtabliſhed in that charge, by the ſoueraigne authority of the Prince: without which neither the alleadging nor the manifeſt proofe, both of his skill, and equity in deciding of cauſes, would auaile him for the proof of his calling to that charge. Yea though he were furniſhed with both kinde of proofes, to wit, as well with that of skill, and equity in iudgments, as with that of the Kings patent, yet who ſeeth not, that the latter is not onely a more certaine and authenticall, but alſo a more eaſie, and plaine proofe of his eſtabliſhing in that office. For to diſcerne this, the only view of the Kings authenticall patent or other writ, accuſtomed in thoſe affaires, with a ſmall knowledge is ſufficient; whereas to diſcerne the other, the skill as well in the nature of cauſes, as alſo in the tenour of the Law, (which is found in few) is required. And therefore he that ſhould proue his Commiſſion, and powre in this caſe, by his good behauiour in his office, ſhould proue that, which is more cleere and eaſie to be known, by that which is farre more obſcure, and more difficult, which to the ſight of all men, is ridiculus and abſurd. And this is true, though we ſhould ſuppoſe, that the proofe of his knowledge, and ſincerity in exerciſing that office, ſhould be ſufficient proſe

of his lawfull calling, and eſtabliſhing therein: which notwithſtanding is farre otherwaies, as will euidently appeare by that which followeth. The like abſurdity they commit, that labour to proue their lawfull calling to the miniſtery, by the truth of their doctrine, and manner of miniſtring the Sacraments, though there doctrine were knowne, to be moſt conformable to holy ſcripture, and their manner of miniſtring the ſacraments likewiſe approued.

7. But our new Reformiſts doe commit a farre more groſſe and foule abſurdity. For the truth of their doctrine, and their manner of miniſtring ſacraments, being as much in doubt and diſpute, as their calling, is it not more then abſurd to produce the truth of their doctrine, for proofe of their lawfull calling? And is not this proofe altogether like vnto that, whereby the ſtarres in the firmament, ſhould be proued to be euen in number, becauſe they be not odde, this being as vncertaine as the other? And yet there is this difference, betwixt theſe two proofes, that he that ſhould indeed proue the ſtarres not to be odde, ſhould ſufficiently proove them to be euen: Whereas he that ſhould proue the Proteſtants doctrine to be true, ſhould not for all that proue their calling to be good, as ſhall be ſhewed by and by.

Hitherto it hath beene ſhewed, that the proofe of calling to the miniſtery, by the truth of doctrine, is inconuenient and abſurd, though the doctrine ſhould be admitted for true. But in the caſe of our aduerſaries, where the truth of doctrine is alſo in controuerſie, it is moſt ridiculous and impertinent. But now let vs conſider the ſecond condition neceſſarily required in a lawfull proofe.

8. Where there is true doctrine, there is not alwaies lawfull calling, to the miniſtery of Gods word and ſacraments: and therefore the proofe of calling by the truth of doctrine, faileth in the ſecond condition neceſſarily required in a lawfull proofe: and is like to this. *Peter* is learned in the Law, and an honeſt man, therefore a lawfull iudge: or *Iohn* is a valiant captaine, and faithfull ſubiect, therefore the Kings Lieutenant generall. For the truth of doctrine doth no more inferre the lawfulneſſe of calling, to miniſter Gods word, and ſacraments, then the knowledg

knowledge of the Law, or skill in martiall affaires, ioyned with honesty, and fidelity, doe inferte the office of iudge or Lieutenant.

It is enident by many instances out of holy scripture, that the the truth of doctrine is not alwaies with lawfull calling to ministery of Gods word and sacraments. For *S. Mathias* before he was chosen to be an Apostle, had doubtlesse the same doctrine, that the other Apostles had, and yet had he not any lawfull Apostle ship. And *S. Ioseph* surnamed the iust, who was chosen to stand with *S. Mathias* for the Apostle-ship, from which *Iudas* fell, had no doubt the same truth of doctrine, that *S. Mathias* had, and the rest, yet was he not an Apostle. Act. c. 1.

The like may be said of the rest of our Saniours Disciples, and of those of the Apostles, who though they had the truth of doctrine, yet were they not for all that alowed for lawfull Pastors, and Preachers, vntill they were ordayned thereunto by the Apostles, or those that had that power from them. For why did S. *Paul* leaue *Titus in Creete, to ordaine Priests in all the Cities, as he had appointed*: but because more is required to the lawfull power of Priest-hood, then truth of doctrine? whence it is manifest that whersoeuer is true doctrine, there is not alwaies lawfull calling, to the ministerie of Gods word and sacraments. Which is yet more euident by the example of *Core* and his complices, who differed not from *Moises* and *Aaron* in any point of doctrine, or manner of Sacraments, sacrifice or ceremonies, but onely in the vsurpation of that function, whereunto they were not called, for the which they were so seuerely punished, as is before mentioned. Who notwithstanding might with much more reason, haue vsed this argument against *Moises* and *Aaron*, then our aduersaries can vse it against vs, and might haue said, we haue true doctrine, and the lawfull manner of ministring the sacraments, alwell as you; therefore haue we the lawfull Priest-hood alwell as you. Which very example S. *Ciprian* vseth against some heretiques in his time saying: *It cannot helpe them any thing, that they are said to know the same God the father with vs, and the same Iesus Christ, and the same holy* Tit. c. 1. 5.

Epist. 76. ad Magnum.

holy Ghost. For Core, Dathan, and Abiron, did know the same God with the Priests Aaron and Moises, liuing in the same law, and religiously inuocating the only true God, yet because exceeding the degree of their ministery, did vsurpe vnto themselues the licence of sacrificing against Aaron, who by Gods ordinance had the lawfull Priesthood, therefore were they stricken from heauen, and receiued presently condign punishment, for their presumptuous attempt. Thus far S. Cyprian, who had he either liued in these daies, or had our aduersaries liued in his, he would haue said vnto them the same, their case being like to theirs, to whom he saith this.

Homil. 11. in epist. ad Ephesios in the moral. part.

And S. Chrysostome confirmeth the same in these words. *Do ye thinke it is sufficient to say they are true beleeuers, and that it importeth not, though the election of Prelates perish? For what doth it auaile, if this be not exact and perfect? for we ought to contend for this, as for the faith it selfe.*

9. By these irreprouable testimonies both of holy Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, it is euident, that the truth of doctrine, cannot be any sufficient proofe of lawfull calling to the ministery of Gods word, and Sacraments. And the reason is, because the truth of doctrine, and lawfull calling proceed from principles, that are different in themselues, and not so dependent one of the other, but that the one may be well without the other. For the truth of doctrine is taken from the conformity it hath with Gods reuealed word: but the calling of Pastors, or commission to minister lawfully Gods word, and sacraments, is receiued from the person of our Sauiour Christ (to whom all power is giuen in heauen, and in earth) by such meanes as he hath ordayned, and instituted for that purpose, whereof there is frequent mention in holy Scriptures, as we shall see more at large hereafter. Which being so, no maruel it is, that the one may be without the other, and consequently that the one cannot be any certaine, or sure proofe of the other. And this diuersity of principles or beginnings, whence the truth of doctrin, & lawfulnes of calling do proceed, is made more manifest by the example before mentioned of a ciuil magistrate. For the equity and iustice of euery sentence, or iudgment in cases of the law, is taken from the conformity it hath, with the law it selfe, and with the nature of the case decided; And the authority of the iudge is receiued from the Soueraigne, by such publique instruments and meanes, as in euery common-wealth are ordayned for that

poſe. Which two things who doth not ſee to be ſo different, and ſo independent one of the other, that the one may eaſily be without the other? as it is alſo in the thing we ſpeake off. For though the lawfull calling to preach, and miniſter Gods ſacraments, doth preſuppoſe truth of doctrine, with other qualities requiſite, or at leaſt ought to doe, yet doth not truth of doctrine neceſſarily inferre lawfull power to preach, as is manifeſt by that which is already ſaid.

10. But here may be made a cauill in this manner. This queſtion, *What is calling?* neceſſarily goeth before this other; *where is lawfull calling, or who hath lawfull calling?* For it is in vaine to aske where it is; vnleſſe it be firſt knowne what it is; But this queſtion, *what is calling?* is a point of doctrine, and not of calling, or authority, and therefore queſtions of doctrine muſt, or ought to goe before thoſe of calling, and conſequently truth of doctrine may be proofe of calling. And becauſe queſtions of doctrine are to be decided by ſcripture, therefore is this queſtion alſo to be tried by Scripture. For the ſatisfying of this cauill, it is to be obſerued. First, that though this queſtion: *What is calling?* be a queſtion of doctrine, and neceſſarily goeth before this other, *where is calling or who hath it?* yet doth it not therefore follow that all queſtions of doctrin, ought to goe before all thoſe of calling. As in the like caſe, though this queſtion, *what is lawful iuridical power?* be a queſtion, of law, not of power, or authority, and neceſſarily goeth before this other, *who is a lawful iudge, or who hath lawful iuridical power?* yet doth it not therfore follow, that all queſtions of law are, or ought to be decided before this queſtion of power or office, to wit, *who is a lawful iudge or who hath the lawful power to iudge?* But when this is in doubt, it muſt neceſſarily be decided before all others; excepting that one, *what is a lawful iudge?* becauſe without the decision of this queſtion, *who is lawful iudge?* no other queſtions in law can be rightly, & iuridically decided: and the ſame happeneth in our queſtion of Eccleſiaſticall calling. *A cauill preuented.*

Secondly, it is to be obſerued, that the difference or diſpute, betweene vs, and our aduerſaries is not about this queſtion: *What is lawfull calling?* For in this we all agree, to wit, that it is the lawfull power to miniſter the word of God, & ſacraments, in the church of Chriſt, therfore is not neceſſary to be diſputed, it being ſuppoſed by either party. But the difference betweene vs is, where this

lawfull power is, or who hath it. To wit, whether the Protestants haue it, or no: Which is the first question of controuersie, that by all right, and lawful proceeding, ought to be decided betwixt vs.

Thirdly, it is to be obserued that though the Scripture doth sufficiently expresse both what this calling is, and by what means it is giuen, and deriued to those, that are made Pastors, as also the temporal law doth the office of a ciuil magistrate: yet doth it not nor can it expresse, who or what particuler person hath this calling. For this necessarily includeth a matter of fact, which is as often repeated, as there is any new Pastor created, and therfore cannot be expressed in holy scriptures: as neither can the tẽporal law declare, what person in particuler is true & lawful iudge, or iustice. So that we may truly say, that the scripture doth declare what is calling, but it doth not, nor cannot declare where it is, or who hath it. And again, that it doth indeed declare it, but it doth not giue it, as neither doth the temporall law giue the ciuill magistrate his office. Therfore though it be true, that this question *where is this calling?* be to be decided by scripture, yet this other question: *where is this calling? or who hath it?* which is only in controuersie here, cannot be decided by Scripture, because this includeth, or supposeth a matter of fact, which the Scripture cannot expresse. But now I wil go forward with my purpose, whence I may seem to haue somwhat digressed, by reason of the obiection made and answered.

11 This kind of proofe of calling, by the truth of doctrin being so euidently impertinent and defectiue, as is already shewed, some that are not so throughly acquainted, with the absurd shifts of our new Reformists, may peraduenture thinke that they vse it not at all, but that they are wronged by this imputation: therefore it will not be amisse to set downe their owne words, that they may be heard speake in their owne cause.

Answer to a demand of their vocation.

First certaine Ministers of the pretended Reformation in France say thus. *If there were no other reason, to proue our vocation to be good, this would suffice, to wit, that we haue the true, and pure doctrine wholly, whereupon the true calling doth depend. This therefore we say, that where is ture doctrine, there also may be true calling, which is an order in the church prescribed by the doctrine. But we haue the true doctrine, as we will maintaine; and therefore doe we conclude, that we may haue the true calling*

though we haue it not from others. Theſe are the ſelfe words of theſe new Paſtors, and *Monſieur du Pleſsis* ſaith the ſame in effect, when he ſaith, *that to thoſe, that aske them for their calling, they may anſwer in one word after our Sauiour, the words which we preach, beare witneſſe of vs:* which is a text of Scripture of his owne coyning, as is before noted. All which ſufficiently sheweth, that they would prooue their calling, by the truth of their doctrine.

But how ridiculous this argument of theirs is, euery child may ſee. We haue (ſay they) the true doctrine. (well for diſputations ſake, we will ſuppoſe it ſo, though in it ſelf it be moſt falſe) therfore (ſay they) may we haue true calling. Be it ſo what then? doth it follow hereupon, that they haue true calling? As well ſurely as if one ſhould ſay, I am a true marchant, and may haue a thouſand pounds in my purſe, therefore I haue ſo much in my purſe. Who would not laugh at the vanity of this fellow? And whereas they ſeeme to brag, that they haue other proof of their vocation beſides the truth of their doctrin, when they ſay: *if there were no other proofe of our vocation, then the truth of our doctrine*: it is but a vaine brag of theirs, for they haue none at all, as is inuincibly proued againſt them, by their owne publike confeſſion, propoſed to the world for a declaration of their faith in theſe words. *we beleeue that no man ought to intrude himſelfe into the church gouernment, but that this be done by election (ſo far as is poſsible, and as God doth permit) which exception we wittingly adde, becauſe it hath bin needful ſomtimes, and namely in theſe our daies, when the ſtate of the Church was interrupted, that God ſhould raiſe men by an extraordinary meanes to redres his church, which was in ruine, and deſolation.* This is the publike confeſſion of their faith, whereby they openly profeſſe themſelues, to haue no other vocation, but extraordinary. Now I coniure them, for the maintenance of this their extraordinary vocation, to bring ſome other proofe of it, then the pretended truth of their doctrine: which they can neuer doe, ſeeing thy haue not, and therfore doe not allow of, any miracles. *Confeſſion of Geneua artic.* 31.

12. I know well that *Monſieur du Pleſsis* in *France*, and D. *Field* in *England* doe ſay, that the new miniſtery hath the ſame ordinary vocation, that is confeſſed by themſelues to be in the Catholik Roman Church. The truth of which affirmation ſhall be examined in due place. In the meane while the iudicious Reader may obſerue, that theſe Doctors in affirming this, doe directly

contradict the confeſſion of their chiefeſt reformed Church of *Geneua*, whoſe Paſtors, as we haue ſeen aboue, do profeſſe to haue no other then an extraordinary vocation. And ſo doubtful euen among themſelues is this matter, which ought to be moſt cleare, as being the ground of all their preaching and beleefe, that they cannot tell whether they ſhould cal their vocation ordinary, or extraordinary. Some ſaying it is ordinary, as (a) *Monſi. du Pleßu* and (b) D. *Field*: ſome extraordinary, as the confeſſion of (c) *Geneua*; ſome both ordinary, and extraordinary, as the (d) Miniſters of France, in the treatiſe before mentioned: all ſpeaking of the ſame churches, without inuoluing that of England, which hath ſpeciall priuiledge, as we ſhall ſee afterwards. All which being well waied, it cannot be much marueiled that the Reformiſts would make ſome shew of proof of their vocatiõ, by the truth of their doctrine. For being on the one ſide deſtitute of all other probable proof, and on the other ſide knowing right wel, that if they ſhould once confeſſe themſelues to haue no calling at all (as indeed they haue not, but come of themſelues, being ſent by none) they ſhould quickly be diſcried to be falſe prophets, and ſuch, as in the holy ſcripture are called *wolues*, *theeues* and *robbers*, they are neceſſarily conſtrayned, to vſe this abſurd shift of prouing their calling, by the pretended truth of their doctrine. The abſurdity wherof, though euident to euery one, that with any ſmal attention waigheth it, yet is it not ſo apparant, but to ſuch, as either are preuented with a preiudicate opinion, of the corruption of the Roman Church, which they impugne, or to ſuch, as through careleſſenes of their owne eternal good (of which ſort the world is full) will not ſtand to weigh the vanity, and leuity therof, it may ſeeme ſufficient. This apparent shift therfore they willingly, and craftily vſe, that vnder the colour thereof (if it be poſſible) they may paſſe this point of their vocation, which is ſuch a ſtraite, as being kept with any indifferent ward, they know they can neuer paſſe: and therefore is by our Sauiour Chriſt called *the doore of the sheep-fold*, which being by any ſlight once paſſed, they are ſtraight in the maine diſpute of doctrine. Wherein though they haue no more ground of truth, then they haue true calling, yet are they not ſo eaſily, and euidently conuinced of falshood and error (to the capacity of euery one) as they are of the nullity of their vocation. For as it is far more eaſie to

keepe

(a) *Pleſſis Treatiſe of the Church c. 11. ſect.* If therfore.
(b) *Field 3. booke of the church c. 39.*
(c) *Confeſſion of Geneua artic. 31.*
(d) *Miniſters of France anſwer ſect. For as much as pertaineth to the firſt.*

Io. 10. 1. 2.

Io. 10. 1. 2.

keep the dore, that the theefe enter not into the sheepfold, then to thrust him out again, being once entered, so is it far more easie to conuince all heretiks, of their intrusion, and want of calling (which is, as it were, to keepe them out of dores: then to cõuince them of false doctrine, and error in faith, which is, to trust them out againe, after they be once entered. And the reason hereof, (for so much as concerneth our controuersie with the pretẽded Reformers) is euident. For they not admitting any other triall of doctrine, the then words of the scripture, and those interpreted and vnderstood, as they themselues will, it is no maruell though they cannot easily be conuinced, of error in doctrine, (I say) conuinced so, as they haue no euasion: which is not peculiar to the heresie of these daies, but common to all heresies, that euer haue beene. For neuer were there any heretikes, that did not alleage scripture for themselues, which if we should suppose to be vnderstood in no other sense, and meaning, but as they did vnderstand it; no maruell would it be, though they could not easely be conuinced of error and falsitie. And for a pregnant proofe heerof, may serue the example of that silly Arian *Legate*, not long since burned in Smith-field, whom all the Doctors and Bishops in England, could not conuince of heresie by only scripture, at least as he though. Wheras in the point of calling, there is no such meanes, either by obstinate wrangling or false pretence of scripture, to cast dust into mens eies, and to make their case if not probable, at least doubtfull. For vnlesse they bring forth the sensible testimonie of their calling, by the knowne Pastors of the church, they are immediatlie without farther proofe, or triall, knowne to be intruders, and rauening wolues. And this is the very true reason, why our new masters would so gladly skip ouer the point of vocation, (wherin they know they cannot hide their woluish fangues) and at the first leape, iumpe into the dispute of doctrine, where they know that only obstinacie, and wilfulnes, and a resolution to stand to no iudgment, but their owne, will furnish them of sufficient meanes, to wrangle till the worlds end. And this is euident not only by the disputes, they maintanie against the Catholike doctrine, but by the endles iarres, they haue among themselues.

The ſixth Chapter.

That the ſole election of the people is not a ſufficient warrant, and calling, to the lawfull miniſterie of Gods word & Sacraments.

1. THat is that lay perſons, be they Princes, or ſubiects, Magiſtrates, or common people, few, or many haue no power to ordayne Paſtors, and to giue them authoritie, wherby they may lawfullie preach, and miniſter Sacraments, or (which is the ſame thing) that no perſon elected by them, may lawfullie without any further calling or commiſſion, take vpon him the miniſterie of Gods word, and Sacraments with them, who haue ſo elected him.

Monſieur du Pleßu, finding belike, that without this helpe, it is not poſſible to maintanie the calling of their reformed brethren in generall, but that ſome of them at leaſt muſt needes be found, to haue intruded themſelues into the miniſterie without any calling, deliuereth this doctrine, which though it ſute well with their religion, yet is it not only moſt falſe and abſurd in it ſelfe, but alſo contrarie to their cheefeſt maſters of reformation, as we ſhall ſee by and by; his words are theſe.

Pleſſis of the churh cap. 11. ſect. and though &c. He ſeeketh all corners to maintaine their calling but in vaine.

Although ſome of our men in ſuch a corrupt ſtate of the church, as we haue ſeene in our time, without waiting for calling, or allowance of them, who vnder the title of Paſtors, oppreſſed the Lords flocke, did at firſt preach without this formall calling, and afterwards were choſen, and called to the miniſterie, by the churces, which they had taught, to the which they had vowed their ſeruice, and miniſterie: yet this ought to ſeeme no more ſtrange, then if in a free common-wealth, the people without waiting either for the conſent, or for the voices of thoſe, that tirranniſe ouer them, ſhould (according to the lawes) make choice of good and wiſe Magiſtrates, and ſuch (happelie) as God would ſerue his turne of for their deliuerie, and for the publique reſtitution. Thus *Monſieur du Pleſſis*. Where it is euident, that in his doctrine, the election of the people is a ſufficient calling to the holy miniſterie, at leaſt in ſuch, as haue laboured amongſt them in the want

want of others, and haue vowed their seruice, and ministerie vnto them. And this do all his arguments prooue, if they did prooue any thing, as we shall see by and by.

2. This doctrine is euidently confuted by *Caluin* himself in these words: *Although there appeareth no other certaine precept of impositiõ of hands, notwithstanding because we see it to haue been euer vsed by the Apostles: their diligent vse therof ought to be to vs instead of a commandement.* And to exclude *Monsieur du Plessis* customarie shift of pretended necessitie, it is to bee noted that *Caluin* speaketh of a time, wherin there was greater necessitie of Pastors, then was or could be euer since, to wit, of that time, when the harueſt was great, and harueſt men but few, as our Sauiour himself saith: And *Luther* the father of all the reformers, *Inquire diligently, if they can prooue their vocation: For God neuer sent any, but either called by man, or declared by miracles, no not his owne sonne.* But let vs see how this doctrine of *Monsieur du Plessis* agreeth with the holy scripture. *He condemneth himself for he was neuer so ordered.* *Instit. l. 4. c. 3. sect. 16.* Math. 6. 37. *In locis communibus, pag. 38.*

First, it supposeth for a ground, without which it cannot stand, that the church of Christ may be so oppressed, and ouer-run with Antichrist, that there remaine in it no true and lawfull Pastors: For so long as there remanie any such, others may be ordained by them, and so it shall not be needfull, to recurre to any extraordinarie manner of ordination by the electiõ of the people, as *Monsieur du Plessis* here mentioneth. But this suppositiõ is not only without all warrant of holy scripture, (which sole reason according to their owne doctrine, is sufficient to conuince it of falsitie) but is also manifestly, against the expresse testimonie of the same, and therfore is euidently hereticall. *Vpon thy wals Hierusalem* (saith almightie God by the Prophet Esay) *haue I set watchmen: day nor night shall they be silent for euer.* If these watch men, who are manifestly the Pastors of Gods church, shall not be silent for euer; how can it be true, that the church shalbe at any time so deuoide of lawfull Pastors, that there shall none remanie to ordanie others? Cap. 62. 6.

And our Saniour Christ giueth vs most infallible assurance of this neuer fayling order of Pastors in his church, for being, to leaue the world by his corporall and visible presence, and to go to his father, giuing that power and commission to his Apostles, by vertue wherof, they were to plant his church in the whole

world, he saith. *All power is giuen me in heauen and in earth. Going therfore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne and of the holy Ghost. Teaching them to obserue all things whatsoeuer I*
Math. 28. 20. *haue commanded you, and behold I am with you all daies euen to the consummation of the world.* Now if Christ be with the Pastors of the church all daies vntill the worlds end; how hath his church been so without true Pastors, from the time, wherin she first failed (as our aduersaries pretend, vntill *Luthers* apostacie, which hath been for many hundreths of yeares) that there were none to giue lawfull calling vnto others, but they were forced to come, not being called, and run, not being sent? Let *Monsieur du Plessis*, and all his crew either deny this to be holy scripture, or say that our Sauiour hath fayled of his promise, or that the church neuer wanted true Pastors. I leaue them to make choice of one of these three things: for one of them must necessarilie be true; And because the two first are blasphemous heresies, they are forced to accept of the third, which being no lesse true, then the other two are false, doth conuince *Monsieur du Plessis* his doctrine to be hereticall: and farther, that all those, that take vpon them the ministerie of Gods word and sacraments, without the lawfull ordination by true Pastors, vnder pretence, that all such as are, or were, failed in Gods church, are theeues and robbers, as not entring by the dore, but climing vp another way.

Io. 10. 1. 3. *S. Paul* also, after our Sauiour Christ, testifieth the same perpetuall continuation of true Pastors in Gods church, in most expresse words saying. *He that descended, the same is also he that is ascended aboue all the heauens, that he might fill all things: And he gaue some Apostles, some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors*
Ad Ephes. 4. *and Doctors. To the consummation of the saints, vnto the worke of the ministerie, vnto the edifying of the bodie of Christ, vntill we all meete into the vnity of faith, and knowledge of the sonne of God.* Is it not euident here, that our Sauiour hath ordayned Pastors, and Doctors to continue in his church, till we all meete in vnitie of faith (that is till the end of the world)? Let the prudent reader iudge what pastors they are like to be, that can pretend no other right, or title to that charge, but the surmised faile of all true Pastors. Surely if *S. Pauls* doctrine be true, such fellowes must necessarily be theeues, that come to robbe and rauen, and not sheepheards.

heards, that should keepe, and gouerne the flocke of Christ) as our Sauiour himselfe doth stile them. And these so expresse te- Io.10.1.2.
stimonies of holy scriptures, do manifestly conuince, the suppo-
sition of the faile of Pastors in the church, to be most false, and
hereticall: And consequently it doth also conuince, the calling,
or ministerie of those pretending reformers, that is built there-
upon, (as the falsly reformed church of France confesseth theirs *Confess.*
to be) not only to be no lawfull ministerie, but also to be a ma- *art.31.*
nifested sacrilegious rebellion, and vsurpation.

Farther the Apostle teaching expresly; *that no man taketh vpon him the honour (of priesthood) but he that is called of God as Aaron*: And againe; *that no man can preach, vnles he be sent*, It is manifest, that those whom *Monsieur du Plessis* confesseth to haue preached first without this formall calling, haue transgressed the expresse prescript of the holy Ghost, And though the choice, and election of the churches taught by them, (wherof *Monsieur du Plessis* speaketh) should be granted a sufficient warrant, for their preaching afterwards (which no man will euer grant) yet himselfe cannot deny, but their first preaching was without commission, or warrant, and therfore vsurped. Neither is it lesse manifest, that the churches, which these men taught, could haue no power to call them, and make them lawfull Pastors. For neither had they this power of themselues, as shall appeare by the answere to his first argument: neither had they it from God by any grant, for no such thing appeareth, either in holy scripture, Ecclesiasticall tradition, Councels, or Fathers, but manifestly the contrary (I speake of such election as giueth power to preach, and not of such, as goeth before ordination) neither could they receiue it from their new Pastors, who hauing it not themselues, could not giue it to their hearers, or disciples: And therfore had they it not at all, how could they therfore giue any lawfull authoritie to their Pastors to preach, or minister sacraments? Certes they could not do it.

This being most cleare: whence will *Monsieur du Plessis* say, that their new ministers (descending from these first conuinced vsurpers) haue their calling? Doubtles from no other, then him, who taugh *Core* to take vpon him, the office of sacrificing for the vsurpation wherof, he was destroied with fire from heauen. Are they not therfore subiect to that heauy sentence, thundred Numbers.
out 16.

out by the holy Ghost in these words; *wo to them, that haue perished in the contradiction of Core.*

Iude 11. 4. Now for the preuenting of certaine friuolous cauils, which in the behalf of our aduersaries may here be made, it is to be obserued, that the question is not betwixt them and vs, whether all the Pastors of Gods church, either were, when *Luther* first began to preach his heresie, or now are, without all fault or note of blame, for their liues and manners; but whether there were not then, and are now in the Catholique Romane church, Pastors furnished with true, and lawfull calling; and at least such, as our Sauiour speaketh of, when he saith: *vpon the chaire of Moises haue sitten the Scribes and Pharisees, all things therfore, whatsoeuer they shall say to you, do yee, but according to their workes do ye not, for they say, and do not.* Where our Sauiour doth euidentlie distinguish betweene the office or function of Pastors, or Prelates, and their life and manners, and will haue them to be obeyed, in that they commaund and teach as his officers, but will not that they should be alwaies immitated in their life and workes; to wit, when their deeds be contrarie to their words, as sometimes they happen to be. This obseruation frustrateth all the cauills, which the aduersaries drawe either by calumnie, or otherwise from the liues, and manners of the clergy, and Prelates of the Catholike Romane church. For though they were all graunted as true (as they are not) yet do they proue nothing against their function, and calling, as appeareth euidentlie by our Sauiours owne words euen now elleaged. Neither can the wickednes of the Pastors of the church, (were it as great, as the aduersaries do falsly pretend) any more iustifie their schismaticall reuolt, and rebellió against the same, then can the corruption, or wickednes of the Kings officers, (supposing they were most wicked) iustifie the reuolt, and rebellion of his subiects against him, though raised, and begun vnder the faire shew, of reforming abuses in his officers. For if they had sincerly intended, any true reformation in the church, and not the ruine therof, they would most carefullie haue kept whole, and entire the vnitie of the same, and laboured by such meanes, as the holy Ghost hath ordained for that purpose, to amend, and correct that which was amisse: and not by running out into open schisme, to haue broken the vnitie of faith, and communion with the church; and there-

Math. 23. 2. 3.

See an excellent saying of S. Aug. cap. 8 before the end some what.

to make the euill altogether incurable, and irremediable. For vntill their Apostasie, the vnitie of the church, and communion of all the members therof remained whole, not withstanding watsoeuer corruption of life, and manners, whether truly being, or falsly surmised to be, in particuler persons, were they priuate, or publique.

5. If they reply hereunto and say, that this course had bene good, and necessarilie to haue been obserued, had the vnitie of the church, or the church it self, continued, but the true church being long since vtterlie perished, and abolished, and nothing therof remaining but a Sinagogue of Antichrist, vnder the shadow and colour, of a Christian church, or congregation, this course could haue no place, no take any effect. To this reply (becaus it is a matter that cānot here be fully handled) I will say no more, then that no man that beleeueth either the old, or new testamēt, can thinke, that the church euer hath, or euer shall (vntill the worlds end) faile or perish in such sort, as here is supposed; and therfore to say, or thinke this, is, but to maintaine one errour, and heresie by another, which cannot be any fit meane, to iustifie their running out into rebellion, and schisme. And albeit my present purpose will not permit me, to prosecute at large the proofe of this propositiō, (that the church neither hath, nor shall faile) yet lest any should thinke, that I haue exceeded therin, and said more then can be iustified, I haue here pointed to some few places, as well of the one, as thother Testament, that make cleare proofe therof, which I leaue to be farther viewed, and considered by thee (carefull Reader) at thy best liking and leasure. *My spirit that is in thee, and my words which I haue put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seede, nor out of the mouthe of thy seeds seede* (saith our Lord) *from hence forth, and for euer.* Esay. 59. 21.

In the daies of those kingdomes, the God of heauen shall raise a kingdome, that shall not be destroied, and his kingdome shall not be giuen to another people, but it shall breake in peeces all those kingdomes, and it shall stand for euer. Daniel. 2. 44. *See also Dan. cap. 7. 14. 27.*

And behold I am with you all daies, euen to the consummation of the world. Math. 28. 20.

Vpon which words M. *Fulke* disclayming from the doctrine, that supposeth the failing of the church saith. *We neither say, nor thinke that the church hath failed: but do constantly beleeue, that it hath alwaies continued, and alwaies shall continue to the end of the world.* *Annotations vpon the testament.*

Luke 1. 33. *And he shall raigne in the house of Iacob for euer, and of his kingdom there shalbe no end.*

Math. 16. 18. *Vpon this rocke will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not preuaile against it.*

Ephes. 4. 11. 12. 13. *And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors, and Doctors, to the consummation of the saints, vntill we meete in the vnity of faith, and knowledge of the Sonne of God.*

Cap. 8. n. 4. *and after.* The arguments, which our aduersaries vse to bring, for the proofe of the churches fayling, are herafter satisfied vpon an other occasion. And now I proceede in my purpose.

6. Hauing thus refuted this absurd point of Doctrine, of *Monsieur du Plessu*, by authenticall proofe of the contrarie, it remaineth to shew the impertinency of his arguments, which he bringeth for confirmation of the same. His first argument is this in effect: It is no more strange for a Pastor, to be called to the holy ministerie, by the people in time of necessitie, then it is for a ciuill Magistrate, to be chosen by them in the like necessitie. But this is nothing strange; neither therfore is the other. Whereunto I answere, that it is a most grosse absurditie, and ignorance to compare the Ecclesiasticall ministerie, or magistracie, with the temporall, or ciuill in this point: thone being a meere spirituall power, to minister, and dispense spirituall things, hauing their effect in mens soules, which as they can only be instituted of God, so also can they only be lawfullie dispensed by him, who is ordayned by God, and therfore the Apostle saith: *Let men so esteeme of vs, as ministers* 1. Cor. 4. 1. *of Christ, and dispensers of the misteries of God.* Thother is a meere temporall power, ouer mens bodies and goods, which no doubt may be giuen by men, as we see in the first institution of kingdomes, or common wealthes. As therfore it is vnpossible for any one, to giue that vnto another, which he hath neither of himself, nor by cõmission from any other, so is it vnpossible for the people, to giue to others the authority, to minister Gods word and sacraments, which they haue neither of themselues, nor by any commission from God: or if they haue, let it be shewed, where this power and commission was giuen them. Hebr. 5. For as *none doth take vnto himselfe the honour of Priest-hood, but he*

is called of God, as Aaron (as the Apoſtle ſaith.) So doubtleſſe much leſſe doth any man take vpon him to giue this authority, but he which receiueth it from God, who is the ſole author thereof.

His ſecond argument is this: Philip *who was but a Deacon, preacheth in* Samaria *without the calling of the Apoſtles, yea and without their priuitie, who notwithſtanding gaue their allowance to the worke.* In theſe three lines are two notable falſities, not in the circumſtance, but in the ſubſtance of the argument. The firſt, *that* Philip *preached without the calling of the Apoſtles.* For he was Deacon by impoſition of the Apoſtles hands, whereby he had authority to preach, and baptiſe, which was all he did. The ſecond, *that he did this without the Apoſtles priuity*, which is not ſaid in the ſcripture, but added to it by *Monſieur du Pleſsis*, who would gladly haue *S. Philip* like vnto their Miniſters to haue run not being ſent, *S. Cyprian* (if his authority be of any weight with him) ſaith expreſly, that he was ſent in theſe words. *They that beleeued in* Samaria, *beleeued in true faith: and were baptized by* Philip *Deacon, whom the Apoſtles ſent.*

Act. 8.

Act. 6. 5.

Epiſt. ad Iubaianum.

His third argument is the example of *Frumentius* before alleaged, and retorted vpon himſelfe, as an euident argument againſt his doctrine both there and here.

His fourth argument is drawne out of theſe words of *Origen. Et conſideremus ne fortè ſicut in aliqua (verbi gratia) ciuitate, vbi nondum Chriſtiani nati ſunt, ſi accedat aliquis, & docere incipiat, & laboret, inſtruat, adducat ad fidem, & ipſe poſt modum ijs, quos docuit, Princeps & Epiſcopus fiat: ita etiam ſancti angeli eorum, quos è diuerſis gentibus congregauerint, & labore ſuo, ac miniſterio proficere fecerint, ipſi eorum etiam in futuro principes ſiant.* That is: And let vs conſider whether peraduenture, as in a city where Chriſtians are not yet borne, if one come thither, and begin to teach, and labour, inſtruct, bring them to the faith, and afterward is made their Prince and Bishop, whom he hath taught: ſo alſo the holy Angels may be Princes of thoſe, whom by their labour they haue gathered together of diuers Nations, and whom they haue made to profit by their miniſtery. Now what argument *Monſieur du Pleſsis* can draw out of theſe words to ſerue his purpoſe, I ſee not. For *Origen* ſaith nothing, but that he, that hath conuerted any city to the faith, may become their Bishop, which no man denieth. For *S. Peter* did ſo

Hom. 11. in 18. numeri.

in *Rome*, *S. Denis* in *Paris*, *S. Auguſtine* in *Canterbury*, and others in other places. How doth this prooue, that the people may make their owne Bishops or Paſtors? But *Monſieur du Pleßis* helpeth himſelfe with his accuſtomed manner of corrupting his Authors, which is ſo ordinary with him, that many authorities ſhalt thou not finde (good Reader) either of Scripture, or Fathers ſincerely vſed by him. And therefore, no maruell, that for ſuch falſity, he receiued that ſhame, and confuſion, in the preſence of *Henry* the 4. King of *France*, and all his court, at *Fountaine Bellean*, the yeare 1600. by that learned Prelate the Bishop of *Euereux*, now the moſt illuſtrious Cardinall of *Perron*, which ſticketh in his fore-head till this day, to the confuſion of himſelfe, and all his adherents, nor euer will be blotted out, but by the humble recogniſing thereof by them all. With this art he helpeth himſelfe here and ſaith *VVe haue example of the people, calling their Paſtors in thoſe of whom* Origen *ſpeaketh, that ſhall come by chance into a City, where neuer any Chriſtian was borne, ſhall there begin to teach, to labour, to inſtruct the people in the faith, whom the people ſhall afterwards make their Paſtours and Bishops.* Marke I pray thee (iudicious Reader) where thou findeſt in *Origen* theſe words: (*ſhall come by chance*) and theſe more important (*whom the people ſhall afterwards make their Paſtors and Bishops*) and learne to know *Monſieur du Pleßis* his fidelity, in this point of citing Authors.

Conference of Fountaine Bellean.

7. To theſe friuolous proofes of his foule, and abſurd doctrine, he addeth like impertinencies in theſe words. *In all the Scriptures, there is not one place, that bindeth the Miniſtery of the Goſpel, to a certaine ſucceſſion: But contrariwiſe the ſcripture sheweth, that God would ſend two ſpeciall witneſſes, to prophecy againſt Antichriſt, againſt the beaſt, (a calling meerely extraordinary) now againſt this beaſt, properly and indeed, doe our Martyrs, and our witneſſes crie out.* This ſhooe is ſo well ſhaped, that it will fit any foot, aſwell the *Arians* and *Anabaptiſts*, againſt the *Caluiniſts*, as the *Caluiniſts* againſt the Roman Catholiques: therefore the ſame anſwer, that they would make vnto it, being vrged againſt them by the *Anabaptiſts*, or *Arians* ſhall ſerue them for this time. What there is in holy Scripture, for the ſucceſſion of Paſtors in the Church, ſhall appeare in due place. In the meane while the Reader is to note, that *Monſieur du Pleſ-*

Cap. 8. n. 19. and after.

dot-

doth alwaies keepe a dore open, that when he hath no other shift he may recurre to the extraordinary vocation, which is the drift of this parenthesis (*a calling meerely extraordinary.*) And in very deede much neede hath he of it, whiles he is driuen, to take it from the Lay-people: which no man will deny, but to be very extraordinary indeed. But of this sufficient.

The seuenth Chapter.

Not all ordination, consecration, or imposition of hands is a sufficient calling to the administration of Gods word and Sacraments.

HAVING in the three immediatly precedent chapters refuted, three seuerall sorts of calling, approued by some of our aduersaries, and necessarily maintayned by them, because they finde themselues to haue no better; it followeth, that here we examine the fourth, which as it hath some more apparence of probability, so hath it more maintayners. And the question is only, whether the ordination, or imposition of hands, by a simple Priest, or Priests, being no Bishop, or Bishops, is sufficient to lawfull calling. For the imposition of hands by such of our Aduersaries, as are, or pretend to be Bishops, shall be examined hereafter at large. *State of the question.*

Al the pretended reformed Churches descending from Luther excepting that in England) are constrayned to maintaine, this sort of ordination by Priests only, to be a sufficient, and authenticall calling. For well perceiuing on the one side the pretence, of internall and extraordinary calling, auouched by the *Caluinists* to be so strongly impugned, that they dispaire to make it good, as in the next chapter shall be proued: And on the other side being manifestly destitute, of all other ordination, or imposition of hands, then by Priests onely:

they ſtand hard vpon the defence of this ſort of ordination, hoping or at leaſt attempting by this means, ſo to colour and maske their intruſion, that they may make it appeare a lawful vocation or miſſion.

Where before pag. 369. or 376 for the cipher is falſe.

2. *Monſieur du Pleßis* hauing therefore made a long diſcourſe little to the purpoſe, of their Miniſters that were ſent by their firſt men, and are come euen vnto them now liuing (for of theſe only the preſent difficulty is, whoſe deſſent is not ſo great, but may eaſily be reckoned, being yet not one hundered yeares ſince it began) he commeth at laſt a little nearer to the matter, and maketh this obiection againſt himſelf, in the behalfe of the Catholiques, and ſaith. *Againſt all this they can alleage nothing but that theſe firſt Reformers of the church*, Iohn Hus, Luther, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Bucer, *and others from whom ours are deſcended, were not Biſhops, but only Prieſts, or Doctors. Whereunto we haue anſwered in one word: that a Prieſt, and a Biſhop in the Primitiue Church were all one, and if they differ now in titles and miters, in the eſſential dignity, they differ nothing at all.*

But it is falſe, that nothing can be alleaged againſt their Miniſters, except their ordination by ſimple Prieſts: which though it be abundantly ſufficient, to proue the nullity of their Miniſtery, as ſhall appeare by and by, yet is it not the ſole thing they want. For though their ordayners had bene true Biſhops, yet their ordination had beene none at all, wanting the true matter, and forme of holy order. Which they muſt neceſſarily confeſſe to haue beene wanting, either in the miniſters, that we now ſpeake of, or in thoſe that ordayned them, which is all one for the proofe of the nullity of their order. For the true forme of holy order being only one in ſubſtance, and theſe hauing beene ordered by a forme quite diſtinct from that, wherewith their ordayners were ordered (as is euident) it cannot be, but the one of the two wanted the true forme of holy order. Which if they will ſay to haue beene in the firſt, they muſt neceſſarily likewiſe ſay, that they were not true Prieſts, and conſequently that they could not make others ſuch, and therefore that theſe new Miniſters of theirs, that pretend to haue beene ordered by them, to be no lawfull Miniſters at all. But let vs ſee, how ſolide this anſwer is, to wit, that *Prieſts and Biſhops were all one in the Primitiue Church.*

The defect which commeth of hereſie is ſpoken of at large hereafter.

3. Doc-

3. Doctor *Field* our Country-man, laboreth to iustifie, the ministery of these reformed Churches, and namely of that of *France*, by the same doctrine, which must necessarily be the doctrine of all those, that will maintaine any shew of ordinary calling, in all these pretended Churches. For euident it is, that they haue no ministery ordayned by Bishops. So that it resteth to be examined, whether such as haue the sole order of Priest-hood, and are not Bishops, haue power to ordaine Priests: or whether Priests,, and Bishops are of equall power and authority: Which question may haue two senses. The first, whether these functions be equall in any respect, the second, whether they be equall in all respects. As concerning the first sense, all Catholikes doe teach that Priests, and Bishops are equall in that, which is the prime and principall power of Priest-hood, consisting in the consecrating of the true body and bloud of Christ, in a true and proper sacrifice of the new law. Which power our Sauiour gaue to his Apostles, (and in them to all Priests lawfully descended from them by true ordination) in his last supper when he said: *Hoc facite, doe ye this.* For this reason these two appellations of Bishops and Priests, are often taken the one for the other in this sort, that as well in holy Scripture, as in the ancient Fathers Bishops are called Priests, and that truely, for they are so indeed: as iudges may truely be called Councellers: or a man may as truely be called a liuing thing, the greater or more perfection containing the lesse. And contrariwise Priests are sometimes called Bishops, which doth not argue, that they were equall in all respects, but in some one, which is true, as is already noted. Now how farre or in what other respects, this equality is to be acknowledged, betweene Bishops and Priest pertayneth not to this place to examine. For supposing they be vnequall, in this one point of power to ordaine Priests and Pastors; though they should be equall in all other respects whatsoeuer, it will be sufficient to determine this question, in our fauour, and against our aduersaries.

3. *book of the Church cap.* 39. *The French ministry was instituted by Caluin who was not so much as Priest.*

Two diuers meanings of the question.

Luc. 22.

4. For as much therefore as concerneth the second sense and meaning of this question, it is the vniforme doctrin, and beleefe of all Catholike men in all ages, that Bishops haue this

power aboue Priests, that they can consecrate or ordaine Priests, and Pastors, which Priests cannot doe. This being proued true, it will manifestly appeare, that none of the ministers of all the pretended Churches reformed, which are knowne, and confessed to haue receiued their ordination, and calling from Priests only, (as they all doe, excepting those in England and in France, the latter comming from *Caluin* who was not so much as Priest, no nor Deacon) are lawfull Ministers, but meere Lay-men, and manifest intruders, and vsurpers.

For proofe therefore of this verity, I will begin with Saint *Hierome*, who of all the orthodox Fathers equalleth most Priests with Bishops, and of whose testimony, our aduersaries beare themselues most confident. This holy Father handling a question, which gaue him occasion to extoll all that he could, the preheminence, and dignity of Priest-hood, and where indeed he saith as much, as can be said in that point; yet doth he euen there expresly teach, that the power of ordayning Priests, is peculiar to Bishops in these few, but not auoidable words. *Epist. ad Euagrium.* *VVhat doth a Bishop except ordination, that a Priest doth not.* *Hom. 11. in 1. ad Timot. initio.* Saint *Chrysostome* hath the same in these words. *Betwixt a Bishop, and a Priest there is almost no difference: for the cure of the Church is permitted also to Priests, and that which he (S. Paul) said of Bishops, agreeth also with Priests. For Bishops exceed them only in ordination, and seeme to haue this only more then they.* But to conuince this from more ancient authority *S. Athanasius* saith thus of one, that was brought in by the *Arrians* his Aduersaries, as one of his accusers. *Apolog. 2. epist. presbit. Marcoti ad Flaui.* *They suborned one* Ischyras, *whom they brought with them: one that was in no sort Priest, albeit he boasted himselfe to be one. For being ordayned by one* Coluthus, *not a true, but an imaginary Bishop, who was commanded by* Hosius *with the rest of the Bishops present in the generall councell, to carry himselfe as a meere Priest, as he was before, and that all those, that had beene ordayned by him, should returne to their former degree.* And the Councell of Alexandria speaking of the same *Ischiras* saith. *In the same Apologie after the midst of the counsell.* *How can it be that he is a Priest? or by whom is he ordered? was this done by* Coluthus? *surely nothing else can be answered: but that* Coluthus *died in the simple degree of Priest, and that all the imposition of hands exercised by him were annulled, and that all those, who were ordered by him, were reduced to the ranke of Lay-persons,*

and

and vnder the name, and title of Lay persons were admitted to the holy communion, it is a thing so euident to all the world, that no man doth thinke it to be doubted of.

What those holy Fathers, and most renowned Pastors thorough the whole Christian world (I meane those of the first Councell of Nice, for by them was *Coluthus*, and his censured) would haue said, or done to our new Ministers, who doe not so much as pretend to be ordered by Bishops, but doe confesse themselues to receiue their Ministery, from such, as were Priests onely, (so shamefully absurd are they) what I say they would haue concluded against them, if either they had liued now, or that these Ministers had liued then in their daies, I leaue euen to the partialleſt Reader to iudge.

5. But yet more euidently is this doctrine of the equality of Priests and Bishops conuinced of absurdity. For the Catholique Church aboue 1200. yeares agoe hath branded the author thereof, who was called *Aerius*, with the note of heresie euen for this point. Of whom *S. Epiphanius* saith thus. *His words were more furious, then humane, saying: what difference is there betwixt a Priest, and a Bishop? the one differeth nothing from the other: it is one and the selfe-same order, one and the same honour, one and the same dignity. The Bishop doth impose hands, and so doth the Priest, the Bishop baptiseth, and so doth the Priest, the Bishop doth consecrate the Misteries of diuine worship, and so doth the Priest, the Bishop sitteth in the throne, so doth the Priest. And with these words he seduced many, who esteemed him as their guide.* And a little after. *But all this is foolish, as is manifest to any of vnderstanding. For how is it possible to say, that the Bishop and Priest are equal? because the Episcopall order is the begetter of Fathers, for as much as it begeteth fathers to the Church: whereas the order of Priest-hood hauing not power to beget fathers: by the lauer of regeneration doth beget children to the church, but not Fathers, and Doctors.* Thus farre *S. Epiphanius.* *Heresi. 75.*

And *Saint Augustin*: *Aerians* (saith he) *are named of a certaine* Aerius, (to wit as *Caluinists* of *Calum*, and *Lutherans* of *Luther*, an ancient marke of Heretikes) *who being Priest, and greeuing (as some say) that hee could not be made Bishop: falling into the heresie of* Aerius, *added thereunto diuerse doctrines of his owne, saying, that the Priest and Bishop, are by no difference distinguished the one from the other.* Hereby it is euident, that if *Heresi. 53.*

these new Reforming Ministers had liued 1200. yeares agoe, they would haue beene condemned with *Aerius*, and put in the ranke of Heretikes with him, for teaching that Priests may ordaine Priests, as he did. Their calling therefore that is grounded vpon this doctrine, is euidently none.

Now in liew of these conuincing testimonies, I may iustly exact of our Aduersaries, for maintenance of their doctrine in this point, and of their calling grounded therupon, so much proofe at least, as either one instance of a Priest ordayned by a simple Priest, esteemed and receiued of the Church for a lawfull Priest, or some decree, or declaration either of the Apostles, or the ancient Church, or at least of the Church, for the whole space of fifteene hundered yeares after Christ, that Priests haue power to ordayne Priests: or if they cannot bring any one of these proofes, (as I am assured they cannot) let them cease for shame to maintaine it any farther, and withall acknowledged their Ministers so ordayned, to be no more but meere Laymen.

6. M. *Doctor Field* laboureth much, in the defence of this doctrine, of the equality of Priests, and Bishops, forsaking therein the ancient Orthodox Fathers, euen those of the Councell of *Nice*, and adhering vnto the condemned heretike *Aerius*. But before I enter into any farther contestation with him, I will aduertise the Reader of a iolly slight, which he vseth, to keepe himselfe free from the note of *Aerianisme*, though he maintaine the same doctrine with *Aerius*. In the nine and twenty chapter of his third booke, being to iustifie himselfe and his Protestant brethren, of that point of *Aerius* his heresie, wherin he taught that Bishops, and Priests are equall, or else to acknowledge it for true, he slightly putteth it of to another place. Saying *of the difference betweene a Bishop and a Presbiter* (marke how fearefull he is to vse the true English word, *Priest*, least the very sound thereof should giue euidence against their heresie) *I shall haue fit occasion to speake in examining the note of succession, and the exception of the Romanists against vs touching the same.* Who would not thinke, but that he intended to purge himselfe of this heresie? or if hee did not, why doth hee not heere acknowledge it for good doctrine? yet when hee com-

D. Feild.

D. Feild doth not only make this word (Presbiter) to be English, of purpose to auoid the true English word Priest which is a sacrificer but must re-

meth

meth to the place appointed, doth hee not ſpeake one word for their iuſtification in this point, but directly maintayning the equalitie of Prieſts and Bishops, doth (at leaſt indirectly) acknowledge, that they are in the ſame errour with *Aerius*, which in the 29. chapter before mentioned (where he should haue anſwered directly to the queſtion) he rather made shew to deny, then to graunt. But let vs ſee, what he bringeth for the iuſtification of this ſo long ſince condemned hereſie.

His first argument is this. *The beſt learned amongſt the Romaniſts conſeſſe that, that wherin a Bishops excelleth a presbyter, is not a diſtinct and higher order, or power of order, but a kind of dignitie, or office, and implopment only wich they proove: becauſe that a Bishop ordeyned* per ſaltũ, *or that neuer had the ordination of a Presbyter, can neither conſecrate, nor ordayne, though a Prieſt, that neuer was Deacon, may lawfully exerciſe the office of a Deacon, becauſe the higher order includeth the lower. Hence* (ſaith he) *it followeth that that, wherin a Bishop excelleth a Prieſt, is not a diſtinct power of order, but an eminencie yeelded to one above the reſt of the ſame ranke for orders ſake, and to preſerue the vnitie of the church.*

He either doth not or will not vnderſtand, the doctrine of theſe ſchoolemen, to whoſe iudgment if he would ſtand, he could not defend *Aerius* his errour. For though theſe whom he citeth, with diuers others teach, that, that wherin a Bishop doth excell a Prieſt, is not a diſtinct order, or ſacrament from prieſt-hood; yet none of them all deny, but that it is either a diſtinct power of order, from that which is in a Prieſt, which power *S. Thomas* in the place by him cited ſaith, *is a power in certaine Hierarchicall actions* (meaning the power to ordaine Prieſts and other church officers) *in reſpect of the miſticall body of Chriſt, aboue that which is in a Prieſt?* or at leaſt the ſame power of order extendded, not by externall depuration, but by ſacramentall conſecration: not by the churches ordenance but by Chriſts owne inſtitution: as *S. Bonauenture* and *Soto*. And if he cannot conceiue, how it may be a diſtinct power of order, and yet not a diſtinct order, let him vnderſtand that one, and the ſame order, may haue diuers powers. As for exãple, the order of Prieſthood hath power, to conſecrate the true naturall body of our Sauiour Chriſt, and alſo to abſolue men, who are the members of his miſticall body (the church) from ſin, ſo likewiſe the ſame order of prieſthood may be extended by Epiſcopall conſecration, to

diculouſly or malitiouſly turneth this word ſacerdos, *a prieſt into miniſter turning theſe words of S. Hierome*, Eccleſia non eſt, quæ non habet ſacerdotem: *in this ſort: It can be no church, that hath no miniſtery pag.* 154. *Lib. 2. cap. 39. ſith theſe being &c. What impertinencie can be greater then to alleadge the probable doctrin of ſome deuins for a certayn grownd of a matter in controuerſie. Supplement. queſt.* 40. *art.* 5.

haue power in ſundrie Hierarchicall actions (as *S. Thomas* ſpeaketh) without addition of any new order vnto it, whervnto the ſimple order of preiſthood cannot reach. And this is the cleare meaning of thoſe diuines, that hold the order of a Bishop, not to be a diſtinct order, from that of a Prieſt, which opinion is probable, but not certaine, (for many moſt graue and learned auctors reach the contrarie) and therfore no ſufficient ground, to build ſo important a point of Chriſtian religion vpon, as is the true calling of Gods miniſters. Yea were it certaine, yet doth it nothing helpe his purpoſe. Becauſe a ſimple Prieſt hath not the power of order, with the ſame extenſion or ampliation which a Bishop hath in thoſe ſchoolemens opinions. And hence it is manifeſt againſt *D. Fields* illation, that in the doctrine of theſe deuines, that, wherin a Bishop doth exceed a Prieſt, is not only *an eminencie giuen to one above others of the ſame ranke for orders ſake*, but a true power of order giuen or at leaſt extended by conſecration, wherby the order of prieſt-hood is extended to thoſe actions (to wit of ordering Prieſts, and other Eccleſiaſticall officers, wher vnto without conſecration it cannot reach. And this alſo in their opinion is the reaſon, why a Bishop that is not a Prieſt (if ſuch an one could be) can neither conſecrate the naturall body of Chriſt in the holy Euchariſt, nor yet ordaine Eccleſiaſticall miniſters; though a Prieſt, that neuer was Deacon, may do the functions of a Deacon. For all holy order being meaſured by the power it hath in, or about the naturall body of Chriſt in the holy Euchariſt, which power is perfected in prieſt-hood: where that wanteth, there can be no higher order, becauſe this doth eſſentially preſuppoſe the other, and where that is, there are alſo all inferiour orders, becauſe theſe are referred, and ordayned to the other, and are eſſentiallie included in it.

7. Hence likewiſe is ſolued that vnſcholerlike queſtion, which he maketh a few lines after, ſaying. *Who knoweth not, that all presbyters in caſes of neceſsity, may abſolue, and reconcile penitents: a thing in ordinarie course appropriated to Bishops* (which is falſe, vnles he ſpeake of publique penitents) *and why not by the ſame reaſon ordaine presbyters in caſes of like neceſsitie?* For as much as pertaineth to the circumſtance of neceſſitie, he shalbe ſatisfied by and by. And for the ſolution of his queſtion here propoſed I will [illegible]

him another, to as good purpose, as his is: why a child of three yeares old can speake and eate, but cannot beget another child, which a man of 20. or 30. yeares old can? The solution of this question will solue also his: For as a child: at 3. yeares hath power to eate and speake, but not to beget a child: which power not withstanding will come vnto him without addition of any distinct nature, by the only extending of his owne, by growth and strength; so likewise a Priest hath power by his simple priest hood to absolue from all sins by these words: *take thou the holy Ghost, whose sins thou forgiuest, are for giuen:* but he hath not power to make Priests without an Episcopall consecration, wherby his order of priesthood is extended to that power, without adding any new or distinct order, speaking according to the opinion of the deuines before mentioned.

His second argumēt may be thus framed, *in case of necessitie euery simple presbyter may baptise, confirme, absolue, and reconcile penitents, and do all those other acts, which regularly are appropriated to the Bishop alone: therfore in case of necessitie, namely all Bishops being dead, or become heretiques, they may in like manner ordaine presbyters.* I graunt that in time of necessitie, a simple Priest may do all that, which is reserued to the Bishop by Eccleſiasticall, or positiue lawes. But deny that the ordayning of Priests (or yet the ministring of the sacrament of confirmation) is such: for that is a power of order, which is as necessarilie required to this action, as the power of priesthood is to thother, and therfore in no case of necessitie can this action of ordayning Priests without this power be performed. And if *M. D. Field* aske of me, what is to be done then for conseruation of the church, in case that all Bishops should be taken away by death, or become heretiques. I answere him, that the same thing is to be done in that case, that were to be done in case, that all Priests were dead or become heretiques, or that were to be done for the conseruation of mankind, in case that all men were dead, which cases are as possible, or probable, as is his case.

But he obiecteth farther and saith, *that the best learned in the church of Rome, in former times durst not pronounce all ordinations of this nature (to wit done by simple Priests in the former case of necessitie) to be void. For Armachanus saith, It seemeth that if all Bishops were dead,* *lib. 11. de Armenors. cap. 7. Halet part. 4. q. 9. memb. inferior 5. art. 1.*

inferior Priests might ordayne Bishops. And *Alexander* of *Hales* saith, *that some are of opinion, that by delegation of the Pope, one that hath holy orders, may giue the same to others.*

8. A weake and feeble ground to build the foundation of Christian religion vpon. I say the foundation of Christian religion; the question in hand importing no lesse. For where there are no true Pastors, there can be no true church, as *M. Field* confesseth with *SS. Hierome* and *Ciprian*, and cannot be denied by any: But where there is no true church, there can be no true faith or religion, as all men confesse, therfore where there are no true Pastors, there can be no true religion. To ground therfore this maine point of Christian religion (*who are true* Pastors) vpon the doubtfull speculatiue opinion of two schoolemen, is either to want all iudgment, or to want all other better grounds for the same; verily I am ashamed in *M. Field* behalfe, to see his litle iudgment, or sinceritie in this point: but much more do I greeue to see the world so palpably blind, as vpon the vaine pretẽce of reformatiõ, to leaue the auncient and troden way of saluation, and to follow by pathes of mens yesterdaies inuention. Especially seying the masters of this reformatiõ, reiecting as insufficient all other proofe of Catholique doctrine, but the pure, and expresse written word, not withstanding when they come to make proofe of their owne doctrine, or grounds of their faith, are forced to vse the doubtfull speculation, of one or two schoolemen. Wheras the certaine, and constant opinion of all the schoolemen togiather, maketh but a theologicall, and not a certaine probation of any veritie: I say doubtfull, for that the one speaketh doubtfully, saying only (*it seemeth*) thother lesse to the purpose, speaking only of other mens opinions, of whom he maketh so litle accompt, that he vouch safeth not to name them, but vnder the vncertaine terme of (*quidam*, certaine) and they speaking also with that condition, which maketh more against our aduersaries, to wit, vpon condition of the Popes delegation. But let vs now say a word of the necessitie, which *M. Field* pretendeth to haue enforced them to seeke their new ministerie, where there was neuer any found before.

Cap. 39. initio.

9. He saith, that this necessitie is only in two cases, to wit all Bishops being dead, or els faine into heresie, now he must suppose this secõd to be their case: wherin (for the strengthning

of his purpose) I will suppose with him (against the truth) that all those, that opposed themselues against their pretended reformation, were heretiques; and yet for all that, shall he not be able to maintaine their ministerie to be lawfullie ordered. For wheras one only Bishop had bene sufficient to haue peopled a greater part of the world, with lawfull ministers (supposing fit men were found) then yet hath of their gospell, it is knowne that there were diuers Bishops (I speake it with griefe) in diuers prouinces, that apostating from the Catholique Romane faith, ioyned themselues with the pretended reformers, whereof *Monsieur du Plessis* doth brag, saying. *Our first ministers had the same calling, and succession, which they (Catholiques) do so much brag of. For Wickliffe, Husse* (marke how he begins their pedegree with heretiques that did differ from them in most points) *Luther, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Capito, Martyr, were Priests, Curates, Doctors of diuinity: I omitt Archbishops, Cardinals in Germany, England, France, and Italy, in whose calling there wanted as litle, as in that our aduersaries do approue, and magnify in theirs.* Seing therfore there were Archbishops, and Bishops in these prouince one only wherof might haue sufficed, what necessitie can they pretend, that their second ministers should be ordayned by simple Priests only? Here hath not *M. Field*, nor *Monsieur du Plessis* (who maintayne the same doctrine) any starting hole, but they must needes confesse, if not an absolute nullitie in their ministerie, (which to all men of indifferēt iudgmēt is cleare) yet at lest must they acknowledge euen in their owne doctrine, a culpable presumption, and ouer great boldnes, as *M. Field* saith pag. 159. in peruerting the anciēt, and euer obserued order, established from the beginning in the church: which note cannot stand with the true spirit of reformation, (which is the spirit of peace and order) but is an euident marke of his spirit, that confoundeth all order. And thus much for *D. Fields* case of pretended necessitie, but he addeth.

Treatise of the church: cap. 11. sect. It therfore. No wordhero of Caluin the founder of y French and Genuean churches who was not so much as Priest.

Neither should it seeme strange to our aduersaries, that presbyters should sometimes ordayne, seing their Chorepiscopi, suffragans, and titular Bishops, that according to the old course of discipline are no Bishops, do dayly in the Romane church giue orders. I cannot thinke his ignorance to be so great, as to make this obiection: whence then it proceedeth, let others iudge: for he cannot be ignorant, that none may giue the

order of priesthood in the Romane church, but he that hath the consecration, and character of a Bishop: or if he thinke the contrarie, let him bring but one instance in the whole space of 150. yeares, and he shall gaine his cause. Neither do I thinke that he is so ignorant, as not to know, that the *Corepiscopi*, of which the auncient canons speake, which he citeth, were not indeede consecrated Bishops (as the suffragans in these dayes are) but were only simple Priests, assisting the Bishop in diuerse things pertayning to his charge, as now vicars generall do, and therfore no maruell, though they could giue no holy orders: and so hath he made an argument euidently against himselfe. But after all this, he cometh to make a shew, as if he would answere that, which is obiected by the Catholiques against this doctrine, and saith.

This distinction of suffragans he may learne of M. Mason. pa. 128.

10. *All that may be alledged out of the Fathers, for proofe of the contrarie, may be reduced to two heads. For first whereas they make all such ordinations voide, as are made by presbyters, it is to be vnderstood, according to the strictnes of the canons in vse in those daies, and not absolutely in the nature of the thing.* Which appeareth *in that they make all ordination* sine titulo *voide, all ordinations of Bishops by fewer then three Bishops with the Metropolitane; all ordinations by Bishops out of their owne churches without speciall leaue. Whereas I am well assured, the Romanists will not say any of these to be void. Secondly, their sayings are to be vnderstood regularly, not without exception of some speciall cases that may fall out.*

Synod. Calced. can. 6. Con. Laodicen. can. 12. Con. Antiochenum, can. 13.

M. D. Field is either fowly ouerseene in this answere, or els would wittinglie deceiue his reader therwith. For the Fathers do not make voide the ordinations of Priests made by Priests, by any positiue canon, as they do the ordinations he mentioneth, but do declare them none, absolutelie, and in the nature of the thing it selfe (to vse his owne manner of speaking). And this is cleare, first by the Fathers owne words: *S. Epiphanius* saith expresly, that Priests haue not power to beget Fathers to the church, but children only, where it is manifest, that he speaketh of the nature of the thing, for such Priests as are subiect to the canons by *M. Field* cited haue not power, (that is, haue not lawfull vse of the power) to beget children to the church by Baptisme. Farther the councell of *Alexandria* before cited, vrging how *Ischyras* (ordained by *Colluthus* a true Priest, but a counter-

faite

faite Bishop) could be Priest, and by whom he was ordered? must needs vnderstand, that he wanted not only lawfull ordination, but true and sufficient ordination. For if he had had true ordination, and only a canonicall impediment suspending the vse therof, the *Arians* enemies vnto *S. Athanasius*, would quickly haue absolued him from that impediment. Againe *S. Hierome* and *S. Chrisostome* expresly denying only the power of ordayning to Priests, cannot be vnderstood otherwise, then of the nature of the thing, and not by the rigour of any canon, for in that sort, they must haue denied many other things vnto them, which (by *M. Fields* owne confession) are at least for orders sake reserued to Bishops. Moreouer how could *S. Epiphanius*, and *S. Augustin* esteeme *Aerius* an heretique, for teaching that Priests might ordaine Priests, if this were forbidden them by the rigour of positiue canon only, and not of the nature of the thing? These Fathers were neither so ignorant, nor so light of iudgment to condemne one of heresie, for contradicting a positiue canon, or at lest would they not haue omitted to specifie the canon.

11. Secondly the Fathers declaring voide the ordinatiõs made by only Priests (as *M. Field* confesseth) and that not by the force of any canon, for there was no such canon, (at lest before the councell of *Nice*, where as we see by *S. Athanasius* all the ordinations made by the counterfeite Bishop *Colluthus* though a true Priest, were declared to be none) this iudgment (which by the confession of our aduersaries is of most weighty authoritie) must needs be grounded in the nature of the ordination, as not proceeding from sufficient power, and not from any canon or constitution, no such canon being then made. For I suppose no man wilbee so absurdly impertinent, as to say that a precedent action auailable of it selfe may be anulled and made voide (for the time when it was done) by a following or latter constitution, though there were any such, which I know not, whether there be or no. And hence it is manifest, that *M. D. Field* his answere to the Fathers authorities, is but a meere euasion, or colour of an answere. But that all may vnderstand the great difference betweene the Fathers declaration, of the nullitie of the ordinations made by Priests only: and the intent of the canons by *M. Field* alleaged, which make voide

future ordinations without title, and the rest specified by him.

It is to be obserued, that the fathers alleaged for the former case, do not make any canon, or constitution for future actions, but giue their definitiue sentence and iudgment of an action past, declaring it to be of no value, whereas the canons alleaged for the second case, are constitutions made for future facts, prohibiting the whole vse of the orders so giuen, and punishing as well the giuer, as the receiuer, but not anullating the order it self, (for that is not in the power of the church, as all Catholique men do beleeue) and in this respect these constitutions are like vnto those ciuill lawes, that make wards or pupils, for these lawes do not take away from him, that is ward or pupill the dominion, which he hath in his inheritance, but only suspend the vse therof, during his minoritie, and therfore maketh voide all contracts, which he shall make, during that estate of wardship. And as he at the time prefixt by the lawe, certaine circumstances obserued, cometh to the full and perfect vse of his lands, without any new purchase or gift, so in like manner those, that hauing bene debarred, or suspended from the vse of their orders receiued against the ordinance of the canons, hauing giuen iust satisfaction to the church for their fault committed, are admitted to the free, and lawfull vse of their orders, without any new ordinatiõ, as is manifest by the cõtinuall practise of the church. So that the difference betwixt the declaring an ordination to be none, and the suspending the vse therof, is very great, as euery one may see.

M. Field his second answere, as it is but his owne assertion without any groud either of reason, authority, or instance in practise, as hath bene hetherto shewed, is easely by vs denied, and with better reason, then by him affirmed.

He concludeth his discourse with this vaine bragge. *Thus then we see that obiection which our aduersaries tooke to be vnanswerable, is abundantly answered out of their owne schoolemen, the opinion of many singularly well learned amongst them, and their owne daily practise in that, Chorepiscopi and suffragans (being no Bishops but only Presbyters forbidden by old canons to meddle with ordination) do with good allowance daily ordaine Presbyters.*

What wit of modestie, honesty, or iudgmẽt these words shew I had rather the reader should see, then I should tell him. First

hath he brought nothing out of the schoole-men in fauour of his *Arian* heresie, as I thinke will appeare by that, which hath bin said in that point. Secondly it is as euidentlie false, as it is true that the sunne is vp at noone-tide that any meddle with gining orders of Priest-hood, in the Roman church, but such as are truely consecrated Bishops. And what these *Chorepiscopi* were which were forbidden in the ancient church to meddle with ordinations, is shewed before, and *M. Field* cannot be ignorant of the difference betwixt them, but he would deceiue his Reader, by the bare sound of the word *Chorepiscopi*, who are forbidden in ancient canons to ordaine, because they were not consecrated Bishops, as is noted before.

12. *Monsieur du Plessis* (to end this Chapter with him) hauing obiected to himselfe in the behalfe of the Catholique doctrine, the authorities of *S. Epiphanius*, *S. Hierome*, and *S. Chrysostome*, all expresly teaching, that Bishops haue the power of ordination aboue Priests, as we haue seene before, formeth thereunto no other answer then this: *But let them* (Catholiques) *not conceale then that which* S. Hierome *saith: that it is by the custome of the Church, and not by the truth of diuine ordinance*, fraudulently applying these words of *S. Hierome* to the question now in hand, of the power of ordering Priests, (against *S. Hieromes* expresse words, and meaning, in his 85. Epistle to *Euagrius*) he speaking in the place here cited by *Monsieur du Plessis*, manifestly of the power of iurisdiction or argument, wherein also he saith, that the preheminence of Bishops aboue Priests, is as ancient as that (*ego Pauli, ego apollo.*) Whereby it is euident euen by *S. Hieromes* testimony, that not only in order, but also in iurisdiction Bishops excell Priests from the Apostles times, which is also cleare by his words when he saith: *That we may know the Apostolike traditions to be taken from the old Testament; what Aaron, and his Sonnes, and the Leuites were in the Temple, the same doe Bishops, Priests, and Deacons chalenge to themselues in the church.* But *Aaron*, his Sonnes, and the Leuites were one aboue another, both in order, power, and dignity; by Gods owne appointment therefore also are in like manner Bishops, Priests, and Deacons euen from the Apostles time in *S. Hieromes* opinion.

Pag. 379.

In epist. ad Titum cap. 1.

Epi. ad Euagrium in fine.

Obserue good Reader, that I haue treated here only of that defect of calling, which proceedeth from the want of or-

der, or power in the party that ordayneth. Whereas there are diuerſe other nullities, or defects, making void the new miniſtery of the pretended reformed Churches, which hereafter we ſhall haue fitter occaſion to ſpeake of.

The eight Chapter.

The defects found in the callings to the Miniſtery hitherto refuted cannot be ſupplied by any extraordinary calling, nor is there now in the Church of Chriſt, any extraordinary calling to the miniſtery of Gods word and Sacraments.

1. THIS is the laſt queſtion, that I haue to diſpute with the Proteſtants in generall; which though it might eaſily be decided by that, which hath hitherto bin ſaid, yet I thought it not amiſſe to make it a diſtinct queſtion, and to handle it a part; aſwell for that ſome may imagine, that though in all the ſundry ſorts of calling hitherto refuted, there are capitall defects, and ſuch as euidently make them none, yet peraduenture they may be ſupplied by ſome extraordinary manner of calling: as alſo for that a great and principall part of the pretended churches, namely that of France, and all thoſe that agree with it, doe not acknowledge any other calling of their firſt Paſtors, but meerely extraordinary. For diſdayning, and abhorring to receiue their calling from the Catholique Roman Paſtors, as from Idolaters, and miniſters of Antichriſt, and hauing no other way to receiue any ordinary calling, they are driuen, to bethinke themſelues, of an extraordinary meanes. Being in this point as abſurd as *VValde*, who of a marchant of Lions, made himſelfe, a Preacher of a new Ghoſpel, and framing his doctrine to his calling (as theſe men alſo doe) taught that lay perſons, might conſecrate, and preach, more abſurd then he, that S. *Hierome* (ſpeaketh of) (what being but a Deacon, and teacher of a new hereſie, could leaue no pedegree after him) ſaying: *The ſect died together with the man, becauſe he being but Deacon could leaue no clerke behind him; but that a no church, that had no Prieſt.* For in thoſe daies extraordinary callings were not hea-

Illirie. Catalog. teſtiũ pag. 370. 371. Oſiand. epit. Hiſt. cent. 9. 10. 11. See Fox pag. 29. 209. Hierom. con. Lucifer.

of, the world being yet not come to ſo great want of ſenſe, as to thinke of ſuch abſurdities.

Order of this Chapter.

Becauſe this queſtion is like to be ſomewhat long, and therfore requireth to be handled with ſome order: I will firſt ſhew, that the French Churches, and others that accord with them, doe teach, this extraordinary vocation, leaſt any one ſeeing the abſurdity therof may thinke I impoſe it wrongfully vpon them. Secondly, I will ſet downe their grounds and proofes for the ſame, and withall refute them; and if in the third place I bring any proofes of the contrary, that is of ſupererogation. For the proofs in this queſtion belong to our aduerſaries, and not to vs; they maintayning the affirmatiue, and we the negatiue.

2. The French Churches therefore falſly pretending reformation, doe not only teach the extraordinary calling of their firſt Miniſters, or Paſtors, but doe publish it to the world as an article of their beleefe, profeſſing thus in their confeſſion. *VVe beleeue that no man ought to intrude himſelfe, into the gouernment of the Church: but that thu ought to be done by election, as much as is poſſible, and God permitteth. VVhich exception we purpoſly adde for that it hath beene neceſſary ſometimes, and ſpecially in theſe our daies (when the ſtate of the Church was interrupted) that God ſhould raiſe men by an extraordinary faſhion, to rectifie, or repaire his church anew, which was in ruine, and deſolation.*

Confeſſion of faith of the French church article 31.

Secondly, this is alſo manifeſt by their practiſe. For albeit they had ſome Biſhops Apoſtates from the Catholique faith, as we haue ſeene before out of *Monſieur du Pleſſis*, and is yet fresh in memorie, yet were they not vſed for the conſecrating or ordering their miniſters, as is manifeſt.

Thirdly, they farther vſe this practiſe, that if any one, hauing beene ordered in the Catholique church, reuolt vnto them, they doe not permit him to exerciſe the miniſtery, vnleſſe he be firſt ordayned againe after their new forme: teſtifying thereby to the world, that they acknowledge no other vocation, then extraordinary. For albeit they pretend that ſuch, as are now called to the miniſtery haue an ordinary calling, yet doe they willingly confeſſe, that their firſt Reformers, who are not yet on hundred yeares old, haue no other then an extraordinary calling. And *de facto*, *Calvin* who was the founder of their new Church was neuer Prieſt, nor euer had other calling then that he tooke to himſelf.

Card. du Perron in his reply fol. ſpeak freely fo. 92. impreſſion 1605.

Fourthly, this doctrine of extraordinary vocation, is ordinary euen in England, at leaſt amongſt the refined and puritan ſpirits. For M. *Fulke* one of the lights of *Cambrige*, is ſo earneſt in this point, that he reiecteth with much vehemencie all order, or calling taken from the Catholiques, without which, they muſt of neceſſity recurre to their extraordinary calling. His words are theſe: *you are highly deceiued if you thinke, we eſteeme your offices of Buhops, Prieſts, and Deacons any better then Lay-men, and you preſume to much to thinke, that we receiue your ordering to be lawfull.* And in another place. *With all our hearts we deſie, abhorre, deteſt, and ſpit at your ſtinking, greaſie, Antichriſtian orders.* And M *Whitaker* another light of the Goſpel hath the like, and if it were needfull, many moe both teſtimonies, and arguments might be brought for proofe hereof, but in a matter ſo plaine, we haue beene too long already.

Anſwer to a counterfeit Catholique pag. 50. Retentiue pag. 67. Con. Duræi l. 9. p. 821.

3. Of this ſo extraordinary doctrine, and practiſe, we may by very good right exact of them at leaſt ordinary proofe; As well becauſe the matter it ſelfe is of principall moment, touching the very foundation, and ground of Chriſtian doctrine, as is plainly deducted before; as alſo for that they are ſo rigorous in exacting proofes of euery point of our doctrine, that they will admit none, but plaine words of Scripture. All this notwithſtanding I dare affirme, that they are not able to make any better proofe of this their extraordinary vocation, then the vileſt, vaineſt, and moſt deteſtable heretiques, that either are, or euer were, may make, or might haue made for there vocation, to preach their hereſies. I will neither except *Marcion*, *Valentinian*, *Manes*, or *Manichæus*, *Aerius*, *Neſtorius*, *Pelagius*, nor our new *Anabaptiſts*, *Familians*, or *Libertines*. If this be true, as in the proceſſe of this queſtion, it will appeare moſt true, who is it, that can ſay, that they haue any proofe at all of their vocation? They will ſay that they haue the truth of doctrine, which none of the aboue named heretiques had, and therefore haue they better proofe of their calling then the other had? This ſingle-ſoled ſhift is effectually refuted aboue, by authority of holy Scripture Fathers, and euident reaſon: And for the preſent I ſay, that they ſticke euer in the ſame mire. For what other proofes doe they bring, for the truth of their doctrine, which all the aforenamed heretiques did not bring. They bring Scriptures: and did not

Cap. 7. n. 8.

Cap. 5. from the n. 2. forward.

the other so also? yea and in as great abundance, and with as great bragges as these doe. But they are condemned by lawfull iudgment to be heretiques, and their doctrine heresie: true, and the very same iudge hath condemned them of the same crime. What difference is there then betwixt them? Surely, none at all But let vs see, what proofes they bring for their new kinde of calling. And as they are proposed, good Reader, I beseech thee take notice of euery one in particuler, and thou shalt finde, they will serue as well, to proue the calling of all the aforenamed heretiques to be good, as of these in whose behalfe they are brought, which one obseruation doth answer them all, before they be proposed.

And that thou maiest know, that they are their owne; and the best they haue, I will tell thee here, before thou goe any farther, where I finde them, that thou maiest see, that I play aboue board.

4. About the yeere 1596. a Gentleman of base Normandy, called *Monsieur du S. Vast*, with a friend of his (both of the new religion) hauing great doubts, of the lawfulnesse of the vocation of their Pastors, and Ministers, and consequently of the truth of their religion, proposed them vnto the said ministers by writing, desiring resolution. The ministers (knowing the axe to be laid to the maine post of their new building) with as much industry, as they could, framed answer, but with so little satisfaction of the parties, that they both quit their sect, and rendered themselues obedient children of the Catholique Roman church. Out of the writing of these ministers, which is extant in the Bishop of *Euereux* his reply to the same, and neuer since answered nor euer will: doe I bring their arguments, for their extraordinary vocation, without leauing out any word of theirs, pertayning to the matter in hand.

The first is: *VVhere there is true doctrine, there may be true vocation, which is an order prescribed by the same doctrine. But we haue the true doctrine as we will euer maintaine, and hitherto haue we not beene conuinced of the contrary. Therefore may we also haue the lawfull calling, though we receiue it not from others.* The absurditie, and childishnesse of his argument is shewed before vpon another occasion. The reader that by himselfe seeth not the impertinence thereof may looke backe to that place: thou shalt finde it in the fifth chap. n. 11. Ministers. Answer.

Ministers. Secondly, *We call that properly true, and lawfull calling which is conformable to the rules giuen vs in the scripture, and which hath beene kept from the Apostles times, vntill this present in all true churches: which we haue at this day amongst vs, and therefore we call it truly ordinary, and receiued by succession from the Apostles; acknowledging no other, that may deserue the name, though it haue continued for some time.*

Answer. If they can proue, that they haue such a vocation, as they describe here, they must needes gaine their cause. But harken, I pray thee, good Reader, how they goe about to proue it.

Minister. *But forasmuch as they* (Catholiques) *vnderstand by this word ordinary vocation, a perpetuall, and not interrupted succession from the Apostles times, we answere them vpon this point, that this is not the definition of true vocation.*

Answer. These are their words immediatly following vpon the other which I could not omit to aduertise thee of, good Reader, that thou maist note the inconstant, doubtful, and wauering doctrin of these new ministers, that with one breath power out contrarieties without blushing. In the lines immediatly going before, that was true vocation with them, *that was receiued by succession from the Apostles, and retayned till this day, and that none other deserued that name*: and now with the same breath, they deny succession to pertaine, to the definition of true calling. Let vs see farther, peraduenture they will make these two ends meete together: they adde;

Minister. *There cannot any thing be gathered to this purpose* (to wit, that succession pertayneth to lawfull calling) *out of any passage of Scripture, or not there, where there is expresse mention made of this charge: and in briefe there is not any promise of this in the whole Scripture.*

Answer: If this be true, then is that false, which they said before in these words: *that we properly call true, and lawfull calling, which is conformable to the Scripture: and which hath beene kept from the Apostles times, in all true Churches till this time.* But it booteth little, to stand vpon the contradictions of men, that maintaine an ill cause: for they will say, and vnsay vpon euery occasion. But let vs see, whether they will remember themselues, and accord their owne sayings.

Minister. 5. *If they alleage vnto vs these promises of Christ: that he will be with his Disciples till the consummation of the world: and that the gates of hell shall not preuaile against the church: we deny that this pertayneth to any succession*

of persons, which is to be in such sort perpetuall, that it is neuer to be interrupted, vntill the second comming of Christ.

So farre are they from prooving that they haue that vocation which themselues say, is properly and only the true and lawfull vocation, that they now labour to shew, that there is none such in the church: nor that euer any such was promised by our Sauiour. Are not these men so turn-sicke, that they know not whether they goe? what more euident proofe can there be, that they haue not that vocation, which they in formall words say, is properly the true vocation, then to see them so directly to impugne it; as to contend that there is no mention of it in the whole scripture? well we will take that, which they willingly yeeld; to wit, that they haue not that vocation, which importeth a perpetuall, and not interrupted succession from the Apostles till this day. And now I will proue against them, that this vocation is taught in expresse words, in the holy Scripture. *Behold* (saith our Sauiour Christ to his Apostles, and in them to all, that shall succeed them, in the charge, or gouernment of his church) *I am with you all daies to the consummation of the world.* Which promise they most impudently denie, to appertaine to a succession of persons, not to be interrupted vntill the second comming of Christ. For our Sauiour speaking there to his Apostles as Preachers, and Pastors of his church, as is euident by the words immediatly going before. *All power is giuen me in heauen, and in earth: Going therefore teach ye all Nations, baptizing them &c.* and testifying, that he will be with them all daies to the end of the world. How can any man, not wholly void of common sense deny, that here is expresse mention of a personall succession of Pastours, to continue without interruption, vntill the second comming of Christ? *S. Paul* testifieth the same in these expresse words. *And he gaue other some Pastors, and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, to the worke of the Ministery, vntill we all meete in the vnity of faith.* So that those that will beleeue the holy scripture cannot doubt of the continuall succession, of Pastors in the Church so clearely set downe in the same.

Answer,

Matth. 28. 20

Ephes. 4. 12.

But we say with S. Augustine, that this is to be vnderstood, of the church of the elect.

Ministers.

It is most false, that Saint *Augustine* did euer dreame, of the

Answer.

ſeperation of the church of the elected, from that of the called (for aſmuch as apperteineth to the profeſſion of faith, participation of the ſacraments, and ſubiection to their Paſtors) and therfore what he ſaith of the church of the elect, which he tearmeth *to be not only in the houſe, but of the houſe*, doth nothing helpe them. Note that they cite not *S. Auguſtines* words, nor the place, for ſo they ſhould haue more euidently beene taken with the lie,

Lib 7. de baptiſmo con. Donatiſtas.

Miniſters. *VVhich God himſelfe can conſerue, without ordinary meanes, yea without Paſtors for a time.*

Anſwer. If we ſpeake of his abſolute power, there is no doubt of this: nor likewiſe that he could haue ſaued the world, without the incarnation, and paſſion of his only ſonne. But if we ſpeake of his power, ruled and determined by the decree, and ordinance of his will, he that ſaith, that God will conſerue his church without Paſtours doth euidently contradict *S. Paul* ſaying, that he hath ordayned Paſtors, *for the conſummation of the Saints, and that we be not like children, carried away with euery winde of doctrine.* Is not the concluſion drawne from theſe principles like to be ſolid? and the calling of Paſtors that is forced to ſeeke ſuch proofes to be very ſound?

The French Reformers in their Cathechiſme teach expreſly that Paſtors are neceſſary for the conſeruation of Gods Church. Sunday 45. Epheſ. 4. 12.

Miniſter. *As it hath happened diuers times, in the church of the Iewes, and ſpecially during the captiuity of Babilon, for the ſpace of ſeuenty yeares.*

Anſwer. If the Prieſt-hood of the Iewes, and conſequently their charge did faile, during the time of their captiuity: whence came all thoſe Prieſts, and Leuits, with other church officers, which are mentioned in the books of Eſdras, to haue returned from the captiuity? Surely they were not then immediatly borne. Read theſe books they ſelf (good Reader) and learne to deteſt, the heretical ſpirit of theſe new maſters, that dare for the maintayning of their owne imaginations, ſo euidently contradict the holy Scriptures, and yet by crying the word, the word, would make the world beleeue, they ſpeake nothing but the Goſpel it ſelfe.

Miniſter. *And before that in the time of* Elias, *as he complayneth thereof to God.*

Anſwer. This is another fiction of their owne, contrary to the ſacred ſtory of the bookes of Kings, and Chronicles, which beare record, that during the perſecution of Gods ſeruants, raiſed by *Achab* King of Iſrael, and his moſt wicked wife *Iezabel*, of which time theſe men ſpeake, the Church of God did greatly flouriſh

florish in *Iuda*, and Hierusalem (the metropolitan city of that people) vnder the religious, and good king *Iosephat*. So that the church of the *Iewes* failed no more, neither in succession of Pastors, nor exercise of the true religion at that time (though the king and kingdome of *Israell* did persecute it) then the church of Rome did faile in the world, in Q. *Elizabeths* time, though she did persecute the same in her kingdome of England, and did her endeuour to extinquish it there. 3. Reg. 22. 2. Paralip. 17.

And after wards vnder many kings of Israell and Iuda, as Azarias the Priest testified vnto king Aza: saying, that many daies had passed in Israell, without the true God, without Priest, without Doctor, and without law. Minist.

It is not easy for any man, to put so many falsities, and contradictions in so few words as are in these. First *Achab*, of whose persecution *Elias* complained, began his reigne ouer *Israell* the 38. yere of *Asa* king of *Iuda*. And *Azarias* spake these words (whereof these men make mention) the 15. yeare of the raigne of *Asa*. How then could this saying of *Azarias*, follow that complaint of *Elias*, being many yeares before it? And yet to make the contradiction mare apparent, they put in the liues of many kings, which also should go betwixt these two. Secondly, how can it be that this default of the church should haue bene vnder many kings of *Iuda*, and *Israell*, as they say, in the time of *Asa*? Seeing he was only the third king of *Iuda*, after the separation of the ten tribes: during the raigne of which kings, the sacred story of the kings, and chronicles make it plaine, that there was no such faile of Pastors, and Doctors, as *Azarias* mentioneth. Thirdly, they make *Azarias* to speake of a thing past, not only contrarie to the veritie of the vulgar translation, which saith not; *many daies haue past*: but that; *many daies shall passe*: but also contrarie to the plaine, and necessarie meaning of the holy Ghost, who bringeth in *Azarias* there, speaking as a Prophet of things to come, and not as one rehearsing things past, as is euident, as well by the words of the text in selfe, as by the circumstances of the thing foretold. Fourthly, they manifestlie corrupt the text, to make it seeme more to fauour their purpose. For *Azarias* saith only, that *many daies shall passe in Israell without Priest, and Doctor*: foretelling the apostacie of the kingdome of *Israell* vnder *Achab*, from the true religion, and worship of God; Answer. 3. Reg. 16. 2. Paralipom. 15. 1. Paralip. 13. 10. 11. 2. Paralip. 15. 3. 5. 8.

God; and they impudentlie, and without all conſcience, thruſt in alſo (*Inde.*) Fiftly they going about to prooue by this authoritie, that the church may be without Prieſts, and Paſtors, may prooue by the ſame, that it may be alſo without the true God, and without lawe. For *Azarias* foretelleth theſe things, as well as thother: yet do I not thinke they dare ſay, that the true church may be without the true God, and without lawe. Let them therfore conſider, how litle this ſcripture helpeth them; and iudge thou alſo good Reader, whether theſe men do handle the holy ſcripture either ſincerlie, or learnedlie, that in ſo few words, do multiplie ſo many groſſe abſurdities, and falſities?

Miniſt. *VVe ſay the ſame of the Chriſtian church, in the which are noted many confuſions, and interruptions, and notorionſly vnder the Arians, a litle after Conſtantine the great; and in the time of his ſonns Conſtans, Conſtantius, and Conſtantinus: all the Biſhops being reuolted, excepting two* Liberius, *and* Athanaſius.

Anſwer. They haue hitherto ſhewed their malice, and ignorance, in abuſing the holy ſcriptures: now they begin to ſhew the ſame, in the abuſe of the Eccleſiaſticall hiſtories. In the time of *Conſtans*, *Conſtantius*, and *Conſtantinus* (ſay they) all Biſhops reuolted, excepting two. Fy vpon ſuch ſhameles impudencie, ſeying the falſitie is ſo apparent, that it cannot be excuſed by ignorance. In whoſe time (I would aske of theſe men) was kept the councell of *Sardis*, where there were Some hundreths of Catholique Prelats? was it not in *Conſtans*, and *Conſtantius* time? That of *Alexandria* vnder *Athanaſius*, the firſt yeare of *Iulian* the Apoſtata, was it not immediatlie after the death of *Conſtantius*, which though it was no generall councell, yet was it of great renowne, for the merit of the Prelats there mett togither? To ſay nothing of thoſe great lights of Gods church, *S. Hillary* in France, *S. Dennis* of Milane, *S. Euſebius* of Vercels, with many more of leſſe note, wherof the Eccleſiaſticall hiſtories of thoſe times make mention: but theſe men care not, what they affirme, ſo they may delude their readers. *Ruffin. lib. 1. c. 28.*

Miniſt. *Of whom it is not reade, that others came to take their vocation, for the reeſtabliſhing of the church: but that God raiſed from the Arians themſelues, men to reſtore the true doctrine.*

The

The further they goe, the more absurd they are. See (good Reader) for thy fuller satisfaction, in this point of repayring the church, in these troubled times *Rossius* his historie; where he saith, that by the councell holden at *Alexandria* before mentioned, it was decreed, that such (the heads excepted) as had any way consented to the *Arians* (abiuring their errour) should be receiued to the vnitie of the church. And they hauing had their calling from the catholique church, did not, nor could not receiue any new calling, but only a reconciliation to the same, from which they had falne, either of errour, or infirmitie. In like manner as the Bishops in England, that had liued either in schisme, or heresie, in king *Henries* or *K. Edwards* time, were reconciled to the church againe in Queene *Maries* daies. So that no default of the succession of Pastors, doth any way appeare to haue bene in those times. Answ. *lib.* 1 *c.* 27. 28. 29.

So many schismes, as haue bene in the church of Rome, do shew, that they cannot brag of this perpetuall succession. Minist.

No schisme, that euer was in the church of Rome, did or could hinder, the perpetuall succession of holy order, and lawfull calling of Pastors. For all the schismes, that euer were in the church, were only about the person of him, that should sitt in *S. Peters* chaire, and not about the power, or iurisdiction of the sea Apostolique. So that those, that did adheere to either party, in good conscience, did not make any schisme with the sea apostolique, from whence all iurisdiction is deriued, but only erred (as thone party must necessarilie do) about the person, who had the true right to the sea of *S. Peter*. Which error could not hinder, or take away the true succession, of holy order in the church, neither in respect of the sacrament it selfe, (as all Catholiques must say, who say that holy order is a sacrament, not depending in essence, and nature of the iurisdiction in him that ordereth, but of his power of order, and character) nor in respect of iurisdiction, which is required to the lawfull vse, of the power of order, or sacramentall character. For both parties did suppose, and in their conscience beleeue, that they did receiue this power from the sea apostolique, though one of them did necessarily erre in the Answ.

perſon, by meanes of whom he did receiue it. Which error was excuſed through inuincible ignorance, and afterwards was wholly remedied, by actuall reuniting themſelues, to the true ſucceſſor of *S. Peter*, when he was knowne. So that this argument of our miniſters, proceedeth a *non cauſa, pro cauſa*, as the ſophiſters tearme ſuch fashion of arguing.

Miniſt. *Aboue all in the time of the councels of Conſtance, and Baſil, which deposing the Antipopes long after their eſtablishment choſe others: which shewed that the deposed had no lawfull calling, nor therfore could they giue any, to the Bishops, and other Eccleſiaſticall perſons created by them, and afterwards remayning in their church, of whom are alſo many others deſcended, who remaine till this day.*

Anſw. This is the ſame argument with that, which went immediatlie before, only the ſchiſme is particulariſed, which changeth not the argument, and therfore it is already ſolued. Where they ſay, that the councell of Conſtance deposed the Antipopes, meaning thoſe three, whereof euerie one at that time was eſteemed by ſome to be true Pope, they ſay falſly as they do often. For euery one of them remitted, or reſigned his right into the hands of the councell, which afterwards choſe another, and ſo the ſchiſme ended. The councell of *Baſil* ſo long as it was a lawfull councell, deposed none, what it did afterwards, it importeth litle, or nothing at all.

Miniſters. *Aboue all in the time of Philip the faire, and when the church of France was ſeparated from that of Rome: where was then this perſonall, and local ſucceſſion? And notwithſtanding they will not ſay, that in thoſe daies our forefathers were pagans, and heretiques.*

Anſw. Moſt ridiculouſly, and abſurdly argued. Would they, that the ſucceſſion of the whole church ſhould ceaſe for the ſeparation of one nation, and that only vpon a cenſure? If the church of Geneua ſhould excommunicate one parish church ſubiect there vnto, would they ſay therfore, that their whole church failed? Intollerable ignorance. And yet this is one of their arguments aboue all the reſt. So may they ſtill argue to their owne confuſion, and deteſtation of their new fangled hereſies. Neither is that, which they adde by manner of triumphe, leſſe ridiculous, ſaying, *that in the opinion of Catholiques, their forefathers were neither Pagans, nor heretiques in thoſe daies.* For be it ſo, what followeth ther vpon, to prooue the ſucceſſion of Eccleſiaſticall order,

order, and calling to haue bene interrupted in that time? yea doth not the contrarie rather euidentlie follow? For if their forefathers were not then heretiques, notwithstanding their separation from the church by excommunication: doth it not well follow, that the succession of the church was not then interrupted? Malice hath so blinded these ministers, that they know not, when they speake for, or against themselues. But if they would know, in what state their forefathers were at that time, I say, they were members cut of, from the misticall body of Christ (supposing the sentence to haue bene iust, which belongeth not to this place to examine) but were quickly reconciled, and reunited to the head againe, without any preiudice to the succession of holy order, and calling of Pastors, euen in the church of France it selfe. For though by excommunication the lawfull vse of holy orders was suspended, yet was not the order it selfe taken away; and therfore the sentence of excommunication being remoued, the power of holy order was restored to the lawfull vse, without any new ordering, as I suppose these ministers do know, though they shew themselues to be most ignorant otherwayes.

And which is more, it is impietie to prescribe vnto God, the meane to execute his promises without his word: and to say that he cannot accomplish them, if the state of the church be not alwaies florishing, from Father to sonne, or from Bishop to Bishop without interruption: and it is no lesse vnlawfull, when it falleth out otherwise, to say (a thing altogether execrable) that he is a lier, and vnfaithfull in his promises. Minister.

Do not these men manifestlie condemne themselues of impietie, prescribing vnto God a new meane (to wit by extraordinarie calling) to accomplish his promises of conseruing his church, without which either he could not, or at least hath not accomplished them, and this not only without any warrant of his word, but directlie contrarie to his expresse word? Farther do they not in like manner condemne themselues of execrable blasphemy, saying that God hath falsified his word, and promise, in not keeping watchmen, and Pastors in his church, vnto the end of the world, which he hath so expressly promised in his holy word: but hath permitted them so to faile, that Answer. Ephes. 4. 12. Esay. 62. 2. Math. 28. 20

that it is neceſſarie to find out a new origine, and beginning of preachers, and Paſtors? Surelie one of theſe two things muſt neceſſarilie be true, either that God hath falſified his word, and promiſe to his church, ſpecified in the places cited in the margent, or that the doctrine of theſe men, teaching that lawfull Paſtors, haue failed in the church, is falſe. But ſeying the firſt is execrable blaſphemie, the ſecond muſt needs be the ſelfe veritie.

Miniſters. 10. *Seying therfore it appeareth not by the word of God, that theſe promiſes aforeſaid appertaine to a perpetuall, locall, and viſible ſucceſſion. And that experience teacheth the contrarie we conclude, that ſhe is not neceſſarie to true vocation; and conſequentlie, that the defect therof doth not hinder that ours, that are called to that charge, according to the word of God, and Apoſtolique traditions, are not the true ſucceſſours of the Apoſtles, ſeying they alſo vſe their vocation to the true end, which is, to teach purelie the word of God, and to miniſter the ſacraments.*

Anſwer. Here they wind vp the faire threede, they haue ſpun hither to to their owne confuſion; and impudentlie ſay, that the perpetuall viſible ſucceſſion of Paſtors is not promiſed in the ſcriptures, and that experience teacheth the contrarie. How euidentlie falſe theſe things are, I leaue it to thee, good Reader, to iudge, by that which hath bene replied to euerie particuler inſtance of theirs. And farther I leaue thee to conſider, how clearelie, and manifeſtlie their pretended extraordinarie calling, (grounded wholy vpon this falſe, and heretical preſumption, of the faile of ordinarie Paſtors in the church) is conuinced to be theeuiſh intruſion, and ſacrilegious rebellion againſt Chriſt, and his church. Neither ſoue the falſe vizard of teaching purelie the word, and miniſtring the ſacraments (a cloathing wherwith all heretiques couer their wooluiſh harts) bleare their eies, that are not already blinde. For the queſtion here, is not of the true vſe of the calling, but of the calling it ſelfe, whether in the lawfull or no, which if it be not, the good vſe therof cannot excuſe the vſurpation, as is euident by the example of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, who is not excuſed from rebellion, by the good vſe of that office, which he vſurpeth contrarie to the ordinance of his ſoueraigne.

11. *For our first Pastors, of whom those that are now, haue their vocation successiuelie from hand to hand truly ordinarie, and restored to the former purity, we say that their vocation was partly ordinarie, partly extraordinarie: If for all that it may be said, that they had it of them, who had it not themselues, at least pure, and by lawfull meanes.* Minister.

Hauing layd a most false, and hollow ground, as we haue seene alreadie, now they begin to build ther vpon a light, vaine, and imaginarie edifice, but fitting the foundation; saying, that the calling of their first Pastors was partly ordinarie, partly extraordinarie, which is as much as to say, meerely imaginarie, and *Chimericall*. *Moises* and *Aaron* in the old law, and the Apostles in the new law, had the extraordinarie: the successors as well of the one, as of thother had the ordinarie: *Elias* and *S. Paul* had both perfectly togither, but that there were euer any, that had halfe the one, and halfe the other, was neuer yet heard of, and certaine it is, that God is not the author of such mingled, and party coloured calling. *For all his workes are perfect* (as the scripture saith.) Whence therefore they haue fetcht this new commission, and ministerie of theirs, the Reader may easilie iudge. Answer. Deuteron. 32.4.

First of all that there haue bene men in the church, that haue had extraordinarie calling, and namelie vnder the law of Moises cannot be denied. Minister.

In the law of *Moises*, there were two kinds of extraordinary vocation, the one fundamentall, as was that of *Aaron*, wherof the Apostle saith: *the priesthood being translated, the law must also necessarilie be translated.* So that though this vocation was extraordinarie in *Aaron*, yet was it the roote, origine, or beginning of that ordinarie calling of priesthood, which was neuer to cease, nor to be interrupted, till the law it selfe did cease, as *S. Paul* witnesseth: thother may be called collaterall, because it did not impugne, nor take away the ordinarie priesthood, but vphold and strengthen it, admonishing the parties then in charge, of their negligence, and carelesnes in their function, reprehending their vices, as also those of the people. Of this sort was that of the Prophets sent extraordinarilie by God to cooperate with the Priests, who had the ordinarie calling, in the due gouernment of Gods people. Neither of these sorts of extraordinarie calling can agree with those, of whom our ministers Answer: Hebr. 7. 12.

here speake, to wit their first Pastors. For the fundamentall calling they cannot challenge vnto themselues, without a new lawgiuer, as *Moises* was, and our Sauiour Christ also. Nor yet do they content themselues with the collaterall calling. For they do not only reprehend the ordinarie Pastors of those faults, which they thinke are in them, as the Prophets did, but they challenge vnto themselues, to be the only true Pastors, and to begin a new line, and succession of ordinarie Pastors. Which without a new religion, and a new founder of the same, cannot be imagined in the iudgment of any sensible, and vnderstanding Christian. And therfore the extraordinarie callings of the old law, are so farre from farthering the cause of our new Gospellers, that it is clearely condemned by them.

Minister. *We demaund therfore of our aduersaries, by what place of scripture they can proue, that this may not happen in the church of Christ. Seying the same reasons, that moued those of the Iewes church, to put themselues forward, driuen ther vnto only by the interiour calling of Gods spirit, are found also in the Christian church, to wit the negligence, malice, and reuolt of the ordinarie Pastors, and the corruption of the Ecclesiasticall estate.*

Answer. In steede of prouing, that there is the like extraordinarie calling in the Christian church, that there was in the church of the Iewes, they bid vs proue, that such a calling cannot bee: As if it pertained to vs, who are defendants only in this point, to proue the negatiue, and they holding the affirmatiue, and being actors might be excused from proofe of the same. What impertinencie is this? Yet that they may know there is a great difference betwixt the church of Christ, and that of the Iewes euen in this respect, we tell them out of *S. Paul*, that the church of Christ is established with better promises, then the other, and that with the Pastors therof, Christ hath promised to be all daies, to the end of the world; and hath said it not only to his Apostles, but also to all Prelates, that shall succeede them by substitutiue ordination, (as *S. Ciprian* witnesseth) *He that heareth you, heareth mee.* Againe when they shall haue prooued the like extraordinarie calling in the Christian church, which is acknowledged to haue bene in the Iewish church

Hebr 8 6. Math. 28. 20.

Epist. ad Florent.

(which

(which they can never do) what wil it availe them ſeing that calling is nothing like vnto theirs, as is alreadie shewed. Farther the Prophets of the old law, did not *put forth themſelues, moved only by an internall calling*, or inſtinct of their conſcience, which theſe men vſe to call the mooving of the ſpirit, vnles we should ſpeake of thoſe Prophets, of whō God complaineth by the Prophet Hieremie ſaying; *I ſent them not, nor ſpake vnto them, and yet they ran, and prophetized*. But the Prophets ſent by God, beſides the cleare revelation either by viſion, or other equiualent meanes of that, which they were ſent about, and alſo the euidence, that it was of God, had alwaies the teſtimony either of miracles, or miraculous predictions preſently after to be fulfilled, whereby they prooued their miſſion to be from God. Neither of which conditions, we finde in our new Miniſters firſt Fathers; *Luth.* indeed recordeth himſelfe a dialogue, which he had with the diuell, for the abrogating of priuate Maſſe, but of any conference he had with God, it appeareth not in all his great volumes. *Hier.* 23. 21. 32. *De miſſa Angulari.*

Hence it is manifeſt, that the extraordinary calling, which the Prophets had in the old law, was a farre different thing from that our new Reformers challenge to themſelues. That which they ſay of the reuolt of the ordinary Paſtors, and corruption of the eccleſiaſticall eſtat as alſo of their deſire and endeuour to reforme it is no more then a sheepes skin clapt vpon a wolues backe, fitting as well the Arians, and all other heretiques, as our Caluiniſts. Our Sauiour Chriſt his promiſes before mentioned, doe warrant his Church, from all ſuch reuolt, and vniuerſall corruption, as they malitiouſly faine to be in it, and conſequently doe premonish vs, nor to harken to their falſe alarms, but to eſteeme them as falſe Prophets, and Wolues in sheepes clothing.

Miniſt. *We ſay farther, that the beginnings of the Chriſtian church having beene wholy extraordinary, the ſame may happen vnto it, in the middeſt, or towards the end thereof.*

Anſw. Deeply argued! wiſe, and like as if one should ſay: the beginning of mankinde was extraordinary, therefore the middle, or end may alſo be ſo. Yea this argument, if it conclude any thing, doth qute ouerthrow their extraordinary calling. For if it be extraordinary, it is not the ſame with that, which went before, if not the ſame, then another diſtinct, if another diſtinct,

then from another course, beginning, or origin then from the Apostles, or our Sauiour Christ, from whom the other was deriued. As it happeneth in the race, or pedegree of any family, the successiue line whereof being once interrupted, it is no more esteemed to be the same race or family, with that which went before, but another distinct, and descending from another stocke, or roote. Whence it remaineth cleare, that the extraordinary calling of these new Reformers must necessarily come from some other origine or beginning, then our Sauiour Christ or his Apostles.

Minist. *Thus farre we conclude at least the possibility, and contingency of extraordinary vocation, vntill the contrary be shewed vs by the expresse word of God.*

Answer. If these men had brought any expresse scripture, for proofe of the possibility of the extraordinary calling, they might with more reason haue exacted the like proofe of the contrary: but seeing they bring nothing but their owne fancies, and imaginations, with what reason can they exact expresse scripture for the confutation thereof?

But I say further, that though we should grant, that they haue proued not only the possibility, but also the true being, of an extraordinary vocation in the church of Christ, (as they neither haue done, nor euer shal do) yet should they haue done nothing, for the iustification of their extraordinary calling, which is already prooued to be such, as neuer was either in the law of *Moises*, or of our Sauiour Christ.

Minist. 13. *But yet we goe further, and proone by the text of Scripture, extraordinary vocation, in the new testament.* S. Paul *hath left vs a most cleare*

2. *Thes.* c. 2. *prophecy of a generall reuolt vnder Antichrist, who shall sit in the temple of God, that is, he shall rule in the middest of the church. But our Sauiour shall destroy him with the breath of his mouth, that is, by the preaching of his word: And if there be Preachers against Antichrist, it followeth, that they shall haue their calling from some other, then from him, or his trayne, who notwithstanding shall haue all authority then vpon earth: or if at other times they haue had some calling from them, they shall execute it extraordinarily: and insteed of maintayning the abuse, and tyrannie of Antichrist, they shall restore the kingdome of Christ.*

Compare this doctrine with M. Masons *succession, and see how thou destroyest thother.*

Answ. This proofe contayneth so many, and so difficult questions, that no man of common sense, would bring it to proue [illegible]

that ought to be ſo cleare and eaſie, as ſhould be the calling of Gods miniſters. But this is done of purpoſe to make thoſe beleeue, that ſome thing is ſaid to the point, that doe not vnderſtand, what is ſaid. I will diſperſe a little this miſt, that the weaker eyes may ſee the ſun, and diſcerne how little it maketh for our Miniſters purpoſe.

Firſt it is doubtfull, whether this reuolt ſpoken of by the Apoſtles ſhall goe before Antichriſt, or ſhal follow him as cauſed by him: Secondlie, whether it ſhall be a temporall reuolt, or a reuolt in religion: Thirdly, if it be a reuolt in religion whether it be a reuolt only of Heretiques, and the Apoſtles meaning be, that till all the heretiques, that are to reuolt, be reuolted, the day of our Lord ſhall not come; or if it be an Apoſtacie of ſome part of the church, which ſhal renounce the name of Chriſt, and adore Antichriſt. Fourthly, whether the temple here mentioned by the Apoſtle, be the temple of Hieruſalem, as the conference of the 9. chapter of Daniel, the 24. chapter of S. Mathew, the 5. chapter of S. Iohn, and the 11. of the Apocalips doth ſhew it to be: or the ſocietie either whole or halfe that ſometimes bare the name of the Church, in which ſignification, the word temple without addition was neuer vſed before. Fiftly, whether the ſpirit of our Sauiours mouth, wherewith Antichriſt is to be deſtroyed, by the preaching of his word by the Paſtors of the church, whereby he ſhall be deſcried, and looſe all credit and eſtimation: or the maieſty, and glory of the ſecond comming of our Sauiour, and the ſentence which he ſhall pronounce againſt Antichriſt, that is, whether it be the word of doctrine, or of power and vertue, which ſhall deſtroy Antichriſt. All which queſtions if they be reſolued according to the doctrine of the ancient church, are ſo far from affording to our new Miniſters, any proofe of their extraordinary calling, to preach againſt Antichriſt, that they will prooue them to be his manifeſt fore-runners, and potent agents to prepare his way. But being reſolued how ſoeuer this authoritie of the Apoſtle, cannot furniſh them with any argument, to proue their extraordinary vocation. For if they will ſay that Antichriſt is to occupie the whole church, it will euidently follow in their doctrine, that the Pope is not Antichriſt, as they furmiſe, becauſe there are diuers Churches,

which they esteeme true churches and to haue the succession of ordinary calling, which notwithstanding are separated in communion from the church of Rome, as the Ethiopians, Grecians, Armenians, Syrians, Russians, and other. So that following this doctrine, they are conuinced, that the Pope is not Antichrist, and consequently that they are heretiques for teaching him so to be. If they say that Antichrist is to rule but ouer one part of the church only, the other being free from his subiection, what necessity can there be to faine an extraordinary calling of Pastors to preach against him, seeing that part of the true church which shall be free from his tyranne, hath meanes to furnish Pastors by the ordinary course and calling? and so are these men euidently caught in the snare they set for others.

Minist. 14. *The same may be gathered, from those excellent Prophecies of the Apocalips, where there is speech of two speciall, and particuler witnesses sent by God to propheſie against the beast; which clearely signifieth an extraordinary vocation, which shall not receiue testimony from vpon the earth, which is declared to follow wholy the beast. And it is not to be thought, that Antichrist and those that are vnder him, will authorize these witnesses in their worke, and put into their hands a sword, to cut their owne throates with, no more then we are to expect, that the church of Rome should reforme her selfe.*

Confer this Paragraffe and that which goeth before, with the fifth following, and see how they agree together.

Answer. *S. Paul* saith: *How shall they preach, vnleſſe they be sent?* shewing thereby that the mission, and commission of Preachers ought to be most manifest and plaine: and these men contrariwise, hauing no other meanes to proue their mission, alleadge their testimony of that booke, which is most obscure, being full of figures and allegories, which as themselues teach doe not proue. And which is more, they alleadge it for the proofe of *Luthers* mission, who denieth the booke to be canonicall, and therefore doth not affoord sufficient proofe of any point of controuersie. But letting all this passe; for of bad debtors cracke coine is not to be refused. I would know of these men, whether they vnderstand this place of the two witnesses litterally or allegorically: if litterally, how will they make it serue to proue their extraordinary calling? seeing the Fathers for the most part vnderstood these witnesses to be *Enoch*, and *Elias*. If they say, that their meaning is only to proue by this authority, an extraordinary vocation, and afterwards to accommodate it to the Pastors, they shall egregiously prevaricate. For first the scripture

Rom. 10.

Apoc. 11.

restrayneth vs precisely to two, and therfore leaueth no meanes to extend it to any moe: and as well may they ground their extraordinary calling of that of the Apostles, as vpō this. Secondly, they cannot accommodate this extraordinary calling to their first Pastors, vnlesse the conditions, and circumstances mentioned by the Scripture doe also agree with them, which they no way doe. For these two witnesses shall worke sundry great miracles as appeareth in the text, which can no way be accommodated to our new Ministers.

But if they interpret this place of Scripture allegorically and vnderstand by these witnesses, the Preachers of Gods truth, contayned in the new, and old testament, whereby Antichrist shall be conuinced, they shall as little helpe themselues. For besides that it is their owne doctrine, that nothing can be proued by allegory, they are by this meanes to seeke a new proofe, that these Preachers shall be destitute of ordinary calling. which proofe they can neuer finde, holding these two points of their doctrine; to wit, that the Pope is Antichrist, and that there are diuers true Churches separated from him, that haue continued the personall succession of ordinary calling till this day. And howsoeuer they teach in these points, no sufficient proofe doth appeare, that the witnesses here spoken of (be they literally vnderstood of *Enoch* and *Elias*, as the Catholike opinion is: or allegorically of all Preachers of truth, as others will) are not also to haue ordinary calling, and to ioyne with the ordinary Pastors of those times, as Saint *Paul* did, with the rest of the Apostles, which hee found in the Church before him. Yea Master *Fulke* vnderstandeth, by these witnesses ordinary Preachers, saying *Christ shall haue his two witnesses alwaies, in the hottest persecution of Antichrist, and therefore is there no neede of* Enoch *and* Elias. This Scripture therefore doth no way proone an extraordinary calling to be in the church.

Gal. 2. 9.

Apocal. 7. sect. 4.

Thus farre we haue shewed in generall, that there may be an extraordinary calling. Now we say that if there be any men to whom this calling belongeth, it is they that in the latter times by the sword of Gods word, which is the spirit of his mouth haue not only reuealed, but also so impugned Antichrist (which wee maintaine is the Pope of Rome and his followers) that we hope hee shall quickly be quite ouerthrowne, such men will we maintayne

Minist.

Marke this parenthesis against M. Masons succession.

maintayne our first Reformers to haue beene.

Answer. These men will maintaine the Pope to be Antichrist, that their first Reformers were extraordinarily called: how? by their hereticall, and impudent asseueration, as the Anabaptists, and Libertins, and all other heretiques vse to doe their heresies. Hitherto haue they not prooued any extraordinary calling in the Church of Christ, but only said, it may be: much lesse will they be able to apply the same to their men, which notwithstanding they must doe, or else all their labour is lost. And yet when they shall haue done that, it will serue them to no other purpose, then to proone that they haue such a calling, as neuer was either practised, or mentioned in the Church old or new. For they will not content themselues with a collaterall extraordinary calling, which only was referable in the old law, but they must haue an extraordinary fundamentall calling, which is neuer reiterated, or renewed, but by a new lawgiuer, and founder of a new religion, such as Moises was, and our Sauiour Christ.

Answer. 15. *And if they demand miracles, for the confirmation of this extraordinary calling, We answer first: that might be iustly done, if they had published any new doctrine, but seeing they brought no other doctrine then that, which is recorded in the old and new Testament, other miracles were not necessary then those, which were done from the beginning by the Prophets, and Apostles, for the establishing of the same.*

Ministers. These men being asked of cheese, answer of chalke. They are demanded for miracles to proone their extraordinary mission or calling, and they answer the doctrine is the same with that of the Prophets, and Apostles. If that were true, and out of all controuersie (as it is not) what were it to the purpose? The Prophets of the old law had the same doctrine with Moses, yet did they neuer alledge his miracles, for the confirmation of their extraordinary calling, but proued it by miracles done by themselues, which was necessary for the stopping the way to others, that pretending the same doctrine, which Moses taught, might intrude themselues into that function without any calling, as many did in those daies, as well as now they do.

Cap. 11. The two witnesses mentioned in the Apocalips, and alledged by these Ministers, in proofe of their extraordinary calling, shall doubtlesse teach the same doctrine with the Prophets,

Saviour Christ, and his Apostles, and yet neuertheleſſe for proofe that they are ſent by God, doe they worke great miracles (as the ſcripture there recordeth) *as to shut Heauen that it raine not, to turne waters into blood, and to ſtrike the earth with plagues as often as they will.* Wherefore that theſe Miniſters may prooue the extraordinary calling of their firſt runners to be from God, they muſt neither prooue it to be the ſame with that of the Apoſtles, confirmed in them by miracles, which without lineall ſucceſſion they can neuer doe, or elſe they muſt proue it by new myracles, which hitherto they haue not done, nor hereafter can doe. And therefore it is euident, that they are of the number of thoſe, that runne not beeing ſent, of whom God complayneth by the Prophet, as is ſaied before. Hiere. 23.

Againe, all extraordinary vocation hath not beene confirmed by miracles as appeareth by that of many Prophets. Miniſter.

It is falſe, that euer any Prophet was receiued as a Prophet, and ſent extraordinarily by God, without extraordinary proofe of his calling. For though the particularitie, whereby euery Prophet made proofe of his extraordinary calling, be not regiſtred in the holy Scripture, as it is not neceſſary they ſhould, yet are thoſe of the moſt and chiefeſt, which ought to be a rule of the reſt. Moreouer, this is euidently proued by the rule, which God himſelfe giueth for the triall of a Prophet in theſe words. *I will raiſe them a Prophet, from the middeſt of their brethren like vnto thee: and I will put my words in his mouth, and hee ſhall ſpeake vnto them all things, that I ſhall command him. But hee that will not heare the words, that he ſhall ſpeake in my name, I will reuenge it vpon him. And the Prophet that beeing depraued with arrogancie, will ſpeake in my name the things, that I did not command him to ſay, or in the name of ſtrange Gods, ſhall be ſlaine: and if in thy ſecret cogitation thou anſwer, how ſhall I vnderſtand the word that our Lord ſpake not? This ſigne thou ſhalt haue: that which the ſame Prophet foretelleth in the name of the Lord, and commeth not to paſſe; that our Lord hath not ſpoken, but by the arrogancy of his minde, the Prophet hath forged it: and thereof thou ſhalt not feare him.* Hence it is cleare, that before any man was bound to beleeue, that any Prophet ſpake in the name of God, or was Deut. 18. 18. & infrà. Anſwer. *If this rule were now obſerued there would not be ſo many falſe Prophets and Preachers as there are.*

truely sent by him, he ought to see some euident proofe thereof, such as God heere speaketh of. For seeing on the one side God threatneth to punish those that doe not obay the Prophet speaking in his name, and on the other commandeth him to be slaine, that shall propheſie not being sent, it was necessary, he should giue them some meanes certaine to know, who spake in his name, and who did not. Which could not be without myracle. And this verity is farther confirmed by our sauiour Christ, when he saith of himselfe (being notwithstanding the sonne of God, and teaching also doctrine most conformable to the holy scriptures) *The workes, which the Father hath giuen mee to perfect them: the very workes themselues which I doe, giue testimony of mee, that the Father hath sent mee.* Note that he maketh proofe of his mission, and not of his doctrine. And yet more plainly he testifieth the same, saying. *If I had not done among them workes that no other man hath done, they should not haue sinned.* If the Iewes should not haue sinned, in not receiuing our Sauiour Christ, vnleſſe he had by doing such workes, as no man euer did, proued his Mission from his Father, though his doctrine was most conformable to the holy Scripture, yea and he fore-told in the same holy Scripture; who can say that any other Prophet sent extraordinarily may and ought to be receiued, beleeued, and obeyed without any other proofe of his Mission, then the pretence of the conformity of his doctrine with the holy Scriptures? especially the conformity of the doctrine with the Scripture being no lesse in controuersie then the Mission it selfe, as it happeneth in the case of our aduersaries.

Ioh. 5.36.

Ioh. 15.24.

16. *And of* S. Iohn Baptist *who wrought no miracle, as testifieth the Gospel of* S. Iohn, *and* S. Iohn Chrysostome *hath well obserued.*

Minist.

If those Ministers could bring the like miracles, to proue the calling of *Luther*, which the scripture mentioneth to haue beene done for *S. Iohn Baptist*, they shall gaine their cause: But seeing they cannot; doth not this instance of *S. Iohn* conuince them of rebellion and intrusion? Besides the propheſies of *Esay*, and *Malachie* applyed by the holy Ghost to Saint *Iohn* in the first of Saint *Luke*, and first of Saint *Marke*; besides his miraculous conception, and enuntiation by the Angell, the imposition of his name, the binding and loosing his Fathers

Answer.

Esay 40. 3.
Mal. 4. 6.
Luc. 1.

speach

ſpeach, the gift of Propheſie giuen to his Father and mother, in his natiuitie, his ſalutation of our Sauiour, both of them being yet in their mothers wombes, and ſuch other miraculous ſignes, that made all the mountaine countrie of *Iuda* to wonder, and to aske what a one he should be? beſides I ſay all this, his life, and example was ſuch, that not only the Iewes held him as Prophet, but *Herode* alſo had him in ſpeciall honour. All which teſtimonies are very farre from ſuting with the brutish luſt, and diſſolute life of *Martin Luther*. Marke. 6. 20.

And here I will aduertiſe thee (good reader) that though theſe miniſters haue bene beholding to *Monſieur du Pleſſis*, for a great part of their diſcourſe, yet are they ashamed of his miracles, which he bringeth for proofe of their calling, and therfore had they rather ſtand to the triall of their extraordinarie calling without miracles, then to vſe the ridiculous miracles which he alleageth, which are all like vnto a shipmans hoaſe, and fit aſwell the *Anabaptiſts*, and what other heretiques ſoeuer as either *Lutherans*, or *Caluiniſts*. For he ſaith the greateſt miracle of all (or rather the miracle of miracles) is, that ſo great a miracle is wrought without miracles, to wit the peruerting of ſo many men, as we ſee follow their new doctrine (we muſt take all their ſects togither to make number, for els this great miracle would not be very illuſtrious:) but ſeying *Martin Luther* and his iſſue preach the broad way to libertie, teaching that no ſinner though neuer ſo enormious can be damned, if he will beleeue, and therby take away all neceſſitie of good workes to ſaluation, and openeth the gape to all diſſolution, and libertie, beſides diuers other points of his doctrine tending to the ſame, it is in any reaſonable mans iudgment, a greater miracle, and argument of Gods ſpeciall prouidence ouer mens ſoules, that he hath no more followers in this large and eaſy way, then that he hath ſo many. For as one ſaith very well, it is as great a miracle, that many men follow this libertine doctrine, as it is for a ſtone to fall downe from high, where it was ſtaied before. And therfore *Monſieur du Pleſſis* not ſatisfying himſelfe with this miracle of miracles, and ſeing withall the neceſſitie they haue of ſome shew of miracles, to proouе their extraordinarie vocation, bringeth another able, as he thinketh, to haue ſatisfied the very Phariſes themſelues, who demaunded ſignes from hea- *Treatiſe of the church cap. 11. towards the end.*

Ibidem. uen, and saith that *during the massacres through all France, that new starre appeared in heauen, of which the like hath not bene seene, but when our Sauiour was borne, which cannot portend, or signifie any other thing, then the bearing againe of our Sauiour vpon earth, by the preaching of his word.* Hereby we may see how beggerlie they are, that hauing greatest neede of some miracle, cannot affoord one. If they had but the least of all those, that haue bene done euen in our owne daies, at our ladies of *Sichem*, and elswhere, in confirmation of the catholique religion, and confutation of their heresie, what triumph would they make? But that the apperition of this starre is most idly, and impertinentlie alleaged, as a miracle prooving either their religion, or their extraordinarie calling, it is euident by these considerations.

First it is so farre from being certaine, that it was a miraculous starre; that is, a starre produced by supernaturall vertue and operation, that it is scarse probable. Secondlie, supposing it was a miracle, there appeareth no probable reason, that it had any respect, or relation to the pretended religion, wherby it may be thought to be an approbation therof. For neither was it foretold, or forseene by any of their religion: neither was it obtained by any of their praiers: neither was it accommodated, or applied to that end by any externall effect. How can it therfore be said to haue appertained to that purpose? Againe it came too late to portend, or foreshew *the bearing of Christ againe, through the preaching of his word by their first reformers*. For *Luther* began his Apostacie, which was the beginning of their Gospell, the yeare 1517. and this starre appeared the yeare 1572. that is 55 yeares after, wheras signes, which foreshew any thing to come, must needs go before that, which they do forshew. And that which *Monsieur du Pleßis* alleageth, that this starre did then appeare, when the massacres were in France, is so farre from helping his cause, that it doth quite ouerthrow it. For supposing that this star was a miracle, and had any respect to the massacre, no man of iudgment but will say, that it did rather shew the approbation, then the improbation therof. Because that God doth not vse to shew his displeasance in any action, by making new starrs, but by thunder, tempests, earthquakes, fire, and the like. Againe new starrs are no signes of Gods wrath, or anger, but of his good liking, and pleasance, as appeareth by the starre, which reuea-

led

led out Sauiour Christ to the three kings. So that *Monsieur du Plessis* hath brought a miracle (if it were a miracle) not to prooue, but to disprooue his religion, and his preachers extraordinarie calling. And here I will put the indifferent Reader in mind of certaine wonders wherof *Osiander* a Protestant-writer maketh mention most probablie pertaining to this purpose, though in a contrarie sense to that which *Monsieur du Plessis* desireth. *Towards the end of the yeare* 1523. (saith he) *at Tribruge in Misnis was brought forth a calfe in forme of a hooded monke: and at Hall in Saxonie a sow pigged a pigge with the head of a Priest.* Which monsters seeme euidentlie to haue portended the brutish Apostacie of *Martin Luther*, who being a religious man and a Priest: the yeare after these hideous monsters appeared, to wit the yeare 1524. cast of his religious habite, and shortlie after married *Katherine Bore* and wheras he had liued chast before (as he saith) he fell into such exorbitant lust that he himselfe testifieth, *that it was no more in his power to be no man then to want the companie of a woman*, with many such like speeches, wherby it appeareth that of a chast religious Priest he was become a most lasciuious beast. For if beasts could speake and vtter their sensuall conceites they could not possible vtter them in more euident sort. Therfore whether those prodigious monsters mentioned by Osiander (the circumstances of the time and place considered) did not portend *Luthers* Apostacie and consequentlie condemne both his doctrine and calling to the preaching therof, let the indifferent Reader iudge. But let vs now go forward with our ministers.

Osiand. in epit. cent. centuria 16.

Osiander ibidem.

Sermo: de matrimonio to. 5.

17. *For as much as appertaineth to the ordinarie calling of our first Pastors, we say that if there were any at that time in the Papacie, it was on their side, because they vsed it rightlie, wheras others did abuse it. And if it be replied, that they fell from their vocation, which they receiued of their Bishops, because they taught other doctrine: the question then must be of doctrine, and not of calling.* Minist.

What miserable blindnes, and peruersitie is this? Euen now these men would maintanie the Pope to be Antichrist, and all that liue vnder his obedience to be his traine: and now are they glad to challenge from him, their ordinarie calling, and power, to preach and minister sacraments. As though Antichrist did furnish Christians, with any necessarie power, for edification, and conseruation of Christ his church, and familie. But let vs Answer. *See their fifth paragrasse before this.*

(contrarie to all right) allow these miserable men, to take the power of ministerie from him, whose power they most bitterlie blaspheme, and let vs see, how they can saue themselues from euident sacrilege, and rebellion. They must of necessitie allow the Pope and church of Rome, to haue a lawfull or at least a sufficient calling: (For otherwise it is vnpossible, so much as to imagine, that they could receiue any such from it.) Seying therfore in their doctrine, holy order is neither a sacrament, nor leaueth in him that is ordained, any indeleble marke, character, or spirituall power, by vertue wherof, all such actions which he doth pertayning to that order, are reall and truly sacramentall, and therfore not to be reiterated (as the catholique doctrine teacheth) but is only a meere morall deputation, of such a person to the function, of ministring the word and sacraments, which being lost, taken away, or suspended, all power to exercise any such actions, as pertanie to that function is also lost, and taken away; and consequentlie, if such an one shall attempt to exercise any such actions, he shall do nothing, but commit sacrilege in attempting to do a holy action, which is not in his power to performe. This doctrine of theirs admitted, how can they pretend, to receiue any calling from the Pope or Church of Rome, which (as they say) long since lost all power, either to minister the sacraments themselues, or to ordaine others to that calling? Surely if their doctrine of the sacrament of orders, and of the church of Rome her reuolt from Christ, should be true, it is as vnpossible for them to haue any true calling to the ministerie, as it is for him to be kinght or iudge, that hath his order or office from him, that being declared rebell to his soueraigne, hath lost all power of ordaining such persons, though he had it before. And therfore as he, that being made iudge by such a one, should in vertue of that ordination exercise that office, should be no lesse rebell to his soueraigne, then he that made him. So in like manner, our new reforming ministers taking their calling from them, whome they esteeme rebels to Christ, and exercising it in vertue of that ordination, can be no lesse rebels to Christ, then those, from whom they receiue their calling. Neither will it auayle them any thing to say, that they vse it well, which thothers did not. For the question is not heere of the vse of their calling, but of their

calling

calling it ſelf, which is prooued by their owne doctrine, to be none at all, and therfore cannot haue any good vſe, but a meere ſacrilegious attempt, to doe that wher vnto they haue no power.

If they ſay, that in the Catholique doctrine, which teacheth, that in holy orders is imprinted an indeleble character, or marke in the ſoule of him, which is ordained, (by vertue wherof, all ſuch actions as pertanie to that order, are made of force) they may haue the ſame true calling, that the Catholiques beleeue to be in the church of Rome. I anſwere firſt, that there is no reaſon, that they ſhould receiue any benefit, from the truth of the catholike doctrine, which they impugne, and which they eſteeme to be falſe. Secondly, how can they thinke their calling to be good, ſeying they cannot maintane it without ſuch grounds of doctrine, as they hold to be vntrue? But let vs grant them once more to shrowde themſelues vnder the truth of Catholique doctrine, ſo much impugned by them; What will they gaine therby? No other thing then that, which our Sauiour ſaith, an old garment getteth by a new patch ſet vpon it, that is, to make the rent greater. For either they muſt ſay, that in the Romane church (from whence they now of neceſſitie are driven to take their calling) when *Luther* was ordered Prieſt, remayned the true, and lawfull calling in Chriſts church, not only for as much as pertaineth to the ſacramentall power, or character; but alſo for the lawfull vſe therof, and then muſt they neceſſarilie confeſſe themſelues to be hereticques, and ſchiſmariques, for hauing left the vnitie of that church, where there is the lawfull vſe of calling, and conſequently, the lawfull adminiſtration of Gods word and ſacraments, which they acknowledge for the only true markes, of Gods true church: or they muſt ſay, that albeit the ſacramentall power, or character alwaies remained in the church of Rome, yet had it not the lawfull vſe therof, being reuolted from the ſeruice of Chriſt. And in ſaying this, they do no leſſe condemne themſelues. For if thoſe that ordained *Luther* had not the lawfull vſe of the ſacramentall calling, where, of whom, or from whence could *Luther* haue it? Surely he could not otherwaies haue it, but by ſacrilegious vſurpation. For to ſay, that he had it extraordinarilie, and immediatlie from God, is both impertinent, becauſe here we

ſpeake of ordinarie calling, and is a deſperate ſhift alreadie re-futed by the authoritie of our Sauiour himſelfe, teſtifying that if he had not done thoſe thing in proofe of his miſſion, that neuer any other did, the Iewes had had no ſinne for not receiuing him. Seing *Luther* therfore neuer did any extraordinarie worke, for proofe of his extraordinarie miſſiō, he is not to be receiued, eſpeciallie the ſonne of God not challenging that priuiledge. Againe it is euident by the practiſe of the auncient church, in the councels of *Nice* and *Sardis*, that ſuch as are ordayned by heretiques, haue no lawfull vſe of the ſacramentall calling, which they receiue, as we ſhall ſee more at large here after. The Proteſtants therfore eſteeming the Romane church hereticall, yea more then hereticall, and notwithſtanding receiuing their calling from it, cannot haue any more lawfull vſe therof, then the councels of *Nice* and *Sardis*, did iudge thoſe to haue, that were ordained by *Miletius*, and the *Arrian* Bishops, which was none at all. So that theſe men are like vnto a bird in a net, that the more she ſtriueth to get out, the more she intangleth her ſelfe, and the faſter she is holden. Neither doth the idle pretence of neceſſitie of reformation excuſe them from their ſacrilegious vſurpation, and rebellion. For beſides that there were diuers true Churches (as they ſay) ſeparated from that of Rome, when *Luther* ran out, from whence he might haue had his calling, and therfore cannot with any colour pretend neceſſitie to run without miſſion. Beſides this (I ſay) our Sauiour himſelfe, might haue pretended truer, and greater neceſſitie, to preach reformation, then *Luther* and his; and yet was he ſo farre from it, that he proued his miſſion by ſuch meanes, as neuer any did, and witneſſeth that without ſuch proofe he had not bene receiuable. Shall we therfore be ſo deuoide of all ſenſe, as to thinke *Luther*, and his crue to be receauable for true reformers, without all proofe of his calling, and commiſſion, vpon a bare pretence of a fayned neceſſitie? Neither is the example that *Monſieur du Pleſsis* bringeth in their defence to any purpoſe. He ſaith thus. *A Magiſtrate called to the gouernment of the common wealth, finding the lawes corrupted by his predeceſſors, the place of iuſtice full of iniuſtice, offices ſubiect to ſale and the like, taketh*

Cap. 11 n. 4.

Fol. 375.

in hand to reforme all, and to reduce it to the cenſure of the lawes. Now would he not be worthie to be laught at, that should aske him by what right or title he doth this? This example he thinketh to agree with their firſt Paſtors, who hauing bene ordered Prieſts in the Romane Church, vſed their calling, as he pretended, to the reformation of corruptions and abuſes crept into the Church, by the negligence and malice of their predeceſſors, and therfore cannot be rightly demaunded, by what authoritie they do it. Let vs admit this example for good, and then aske of *Monſieur du Pleſſis*, what anſwere he would giue vnto the *Arians*, and *Anabaptiſts*, making this argument againſt the reformed Churches of *Germany* and France. I ſuppoſe he would ſay, that their pretence of reformation is but a vizard, and cloake, to enter into the Church, and afterwards to diſturbe the peace therof, and to draw men into errour. And that if euerie one pretending reformation were to be hearkened vnto, either in the eccleſiaſticall, or ciuill eſtate, it would bee vnpoſſible to keepe any peace, or order in either. This ſame anſwere will fit *Monſieur du Pleſſis* his example. Secondly this example maketh nothing to the purpoſe, vnles theſe two things be prooued. Firſt, that the Church may be ſo corrupt in doctrine, and manners, as that no Paſtors remaine vncorrupt to reforme it.

Secondly, that it was in that ſtate, when *Luther* ran out of the Church. For vnles theſe be prooued, what appearance of probabilitie can there be in this example? But it is as poſſible to prooue theſe things, as it is to prooue the holy ſcripture to be falſe, or God to haue failed in his promiſe, as hath bene shewed before.

Thirdly, *Luther* and his folowers do not pretend only to reforme the corruptions which they falſly imagin to be in the Churh, but they would thruſt out of office the true and lawfull Paſtors, by whom they receiued their calling of prieſthood, and make themſelues the ſole rulers and gouernours, not of Gods Church, but of a congregation of their owne gathering. Which abſurd abuſe

if any ſeditiouſe head ſhould attempt in the temporall ſtate, he would quickly be recompenſed with the hire due vnto ſuch a one. This example therefore of *Monſieur du Pleſſis* being rightly applyed doth manifeſtly comdemne *Luther* and all his Seditious brood.

Miniſt. 18. *Or if it be ſaid, that the greater part amoungſt them being only Prieſts could not giue calling to others, we ſend them to S. Hierome, who teacheth, that that power is common to Bishops and Prieſt, and S. Ambroſe confirmeth the ſame. It appeareth therfore, that in what ſort ſoeuer they take it, they are not without calling, and hauing it, they haue power to giue it to others, and theſe exerciſing it faithfully haue the true title, and poſſeſſion of it.*

Anſwer. How falſly they Father this doctrine vpon *S. Hierome* is shewed before, for he teacheth the quite contrarie saying *what other thing doth a Bishop, that a Prieſt doth not, except ordering or giuing of orders?* And as falſly they cite *S. Ambroſe*. So that it manifeſtly appeareth by that, which hath hitherto bene anſwered, to all their ſlender proofes, of their partie coloured calling, halfe ordinarie, halfe extraordinarie, that they haue none at all; and therfore are conuinced to be theeues, and robbers, climing vp another way, and not entring by the doore: and ſuch as God complaineth of by the Prophet, that Propheſie in his name without ſending, and run without bidding.

Epiſt. to Euagrius.

Iohn. 10. 1.

Ieremy. 23.

The third part of this chapter. 19. And albeit it be abundantlie ſufficient, for the rejecting of this new pretended miniſterie, to haue ſo euidentlie refuted the proofes therof (our aduerſaries being appellants in this cauſe, and we only defendants) yet of ſupererogation, and abundant declaration of triumphing truth, I will here briefly shewe that there can be no true calling to the miniſterie of Gods word, and ſacraments in Chriſt his Church, but that which is giuen and receiued from one to another from our Sauiour Chriſt, the true fountaine, and ſource of all lawfull power euen till this day, wherby it will clearelie appeare, that the pretended Churches of reformation in France, and all thoſe that agree with them, haue no true calling at all. For they

they willingly confesse as we haue seene before, that their calling is extraordinary, and therefore not receiued from their predecessors (I speake of their first Pastors as they tearme them) but immediatly from God, as *Moises*, the Prophets, and Apostles did. And omitting those two euident testimonies of our Sauiour Christ, and *S. Paul* (before cited for the like purpose) prouing a continuall, and not interpreted succession of Pastours in the church, till the worlds end. I will heere only deduce the same tradition, or deliuery of calling, from one to another, first out of holy Scripture, so far as the story therof reacheth, and then out of the doctrine of the auncient church, which our aduersaries dare not reiect. Math. 28. 20. Eph. 4. 12. *interrupted*

The holy scripture to shew the weight and moment of this calling, doth often, and in most cleere tearmes declare, that our Sauiour himselfe did not take vpon him this dignity, but by mission from his father, *S. Paul* saying, that *he glorified not himselfe that he might be made high-priest, but he that said vnto him, thou art my sonne, this day I haue begotten thee*. And in another place: *Thou art a Priest for euer*. And againe: *This is my beloued sonne, heare yee him*; with many other like testimonies of his calling to the function of Priesthood, which he exercised according to his humanity. According to which hauing receiued from his Father, all power in heauen and in earth, he sent his Apostles to preach, and minister the sacraments saying. *All power is giuen me in heauen, and in earth, going therefore teach ye all Nations, baptising them*. And in another place: *As my Father sent me, so I send you*. The Apostles thus sent, sent others their disciples *S. Paul* saying to *Timothy*. *I admonish thee, that thou resuscitate the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands*. And those disciples sent others. For the same Apostle saith to *Titus*. *For this cause I left thee in* Creete, *that thou shouldest reforme those things that are wanting, and shouldest ordaine Priests by cities, as I also appointed thee*. So that we haue in the holy Scripture, the calling not only of the Apostles, and their disciples, but of their disciples disciples, one being called by another, as the sonne by the father, euen vntill our sauiour Christ, the head and fountaine of all calling and mission. And that this selfe same line, and succession of calling hath euer since continued it is euident, both by the personall succession of Pastors in the see Apostolique, which is so euidently knowne, that *M. Fulke* Heb. 5. 5. Math. 7. 5. 2. Pet. 1. Math. 28. 18. 19. Iohn 20. 21. 2. Tim. 1. 6.

Answer to a counterfait Catho. p. 27.

faith, *we can count it on our fingers ends*, as also by the doctrinall testimonies of the most ancient fathers, whereof some I will here set downe, I say doctrinall testimonies, because they are not only testimonies of the beleefe and practise of the church, in the time wherein they liued, but also are rules for all times concerning that matter. *S. Ireneus* Bishop of Lions, and martyr,

Lib. 4. c. 43. disciple of the Apostles disciples saith thus. *We must obey those Priests, that are in the church, that haue the succession from the Apostles (as we haue shewed) that together with the succession of Episcopall power, haue according to the good pleasure of the Father receiued the certain gift of truth. But others that are not of the orignall succession, in what place soeuer they are assembled, to haue suspected, either as heretiques and of bad doctrine, or as schismatiques and highminded, or as hipocrites which doe this for couetousnesse, either of gaine, or vaine glory.*

Lib. de præscriptionibus cap. 32. *Tertullian* not much after *S. Ireneus* saith *Let them* (the Heretiques) *bring forth the origin or beginning of their churches, let them looke thorow the order of their Bishops, so descending by succession from the beginning, that their first Bishop haue for his ordainer and predecessour, some of the Apostles or Apostolicall men, who yet haue continued with the Apostles to the end. For in this manner doe the Apostolicall churches verifie their pedegree, as the church of Smyrna produceth* Policarpe, *placed there by* S. Iohn, *and*

Contr. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5. *that of Rome* Clement *ordayned by* S. Peter. And againe: *wee haue churches founded by* Iohn: *For though* Marcion *reiect his Apocalips, yet the order of Bishops reckoned from the beginning will rest in* Iohn *as the author, and so is the nobility of other churches knowne.* And lower: *He hath also churches, but his are as much latter, as they are adulterous, whose genealogie if you seeke, you shall rather finde them Apostatique, then Apostolique.* Marcion *or some of his troope being the founder.*

De vnitate eccles. *S. Cyprian* in the age following. *These are they that of themselues without commission from God, doe vsurpe Prelacy amongst certaine auditors disorderly gathered together, that make themselues Pastors without any lawfull ordination, that take vpon them the title of Bishop, without that any man giue them a Bishops place or authority, at whom, the holy Ghost in the Psalmes doth point as sitting in the chaire of pestilence, being the plagues and ruines of true faith.* And in another place. *Christ said to his Apostles, and consequently to all Prelats, that by substitutiue ordination doe succeed the Apostles,*

Epist. 69. to Florentius. *he that heareth you heareth mee.*

Lib. 2. con. Parmenian. *Optatus Milevitanus* in the age after *S. Cyprian*, hauing reckoned vp the Bishops of Rome from *S. Peter* (whom he calleth the head

head of all the Apostles) vntill *Siricius* then Bishop. *Giue vs* (saith hee to *Parmenian* primate of the Donatists) *the beginning or origen of your chaire, you that chalenge vnto you the Church of God.*

S. Hierome saith of a certain heretique one *Hilarius*: *The sect perished together with the man, because he being but Deacon could not ordaine any Clergy to remaine after him: but where there is no Priest, there is no Church.* Dialog. con. Luciferianos

S. Augustine saith to the Donatists. *Number vp the Priests from after S Peter, and see who in that line of Fathers succeeded others: that is the rocke, which the proud gates of hell shall not ouercome.* In the Psalm against the party of Donatus.

Now dare I appeale to the iudicious Reader, be he friend or foe, Catholique or Protestant, whether these Fathers deliuering this doctrine, could so much as dreame of any extraordinary calling in the church, immediatly from God, such as our new Reformers, seeing themselues euidently without ordinary calling, are forced to recurre vnto. Surely if they had not presupposed as a most sure, and infallible ground, that the calling, which our Sauiour Christ instituted, and left in his Church, should euer continue, and descend from one to another by not interrupted succession, they could not but haue seene, and knowne, that their arguments proposed, and vrged against the heretiques of their time, in such sort as is before related, could haue no force at all: their aduersaries hauing alwaies most easie recourse, to their extraordinary and immediate calling from God, which would haue deluded all their arguments. But this shift of maintayning heresie is so euidently absurd, that till our age it seemeth, the diuell could finde none so senseles or shameless that would put it in practise.

Monsieur du Plessis after all shifts possible vsed, for the maintayning of their new Ministery, and seeing (as it is likely) that all he had, or could say was not sufficient to make it good commeth at last to say, that the question of calling is superfluous, and nothing at all pertayning to the proofe of the true Church: which he goeth about to shew out of the conference of Carthage, betweene the Catholiques, and Donatists in this sort.

The question was betweene the Catholiques and Donatists, where the true Church might be: And to cleare the same the conference of Carthage was held by the authority of the Emperour Honorius, *in the presence of the tribune* Marcellinus: *S. Augustine who spake for the Catholiques, would examine* Plessis of the Church pag. 369.

mine it by the Scriptures: Petilian who defended the cauſe of the Do[natiſts] by the calling of the Biſhops, thinking to bring him to this point, to name Cecilian Biſhop of Africa for his ordinator, whom they pretended to haue beene the holy bookes, and thereby made vncapable both of being Biſhop, and ordayning others: who art thou? (ſaith Petilian to S. Auguſtine) and whence haſt thou thy beginning? and who is thy father? (that is, who conſecrated thee?) and where is thy head and thy fountaine, and if thou haue none, art thou not then an heretique? S. Auſtin who will alwaies come to the ground, what anſwereth hee? This queſtion, ſaith he, is but a cauill, and an euaſion belonging no whit to the cauſe of truth &c. I am (ſaith he) in that church which Cecilian was in: my communion began at theſe words. It behooued that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer and riſe againe the third day, and that remiſſion of ſinnes ſhould be preached in his name, beginning at Hieruſalem, and from thence throughout all the world. Cecilian was my brother, and not my Father, nor he that conſecrated mee. In this caſe I acknowledge no (a) father but God, no head but Chriſt: For although the Apoſtle ſay I haue begotten you, yet that thou maieſt know, that the baſe or foundation of that father-hood is not humane, he addeth (by the Goſpel of Chriſt) In a word (ſaith he) to omit thoſe ſuperfluous demands, I am a Chriſtian, a faithfull man, a Catholique, I defend one church, the which, whatſoeuer I am, is a church: And to reſolue the Megalius hath ordayned me Biſhop let vs come (b) to the matter, let vs come to the ſcriptures.

(a) S. Auguſtine hath no ſuch words.

(b) Falſification: no ſuch thing in S. Auguſtin.

The ſame we ſay with S. Auguſtine to our aduerſaries, you aske what the calling was of the firſt Reformers? from whom our calling doth deſcend? it was the (c) ſame that yours is, faulty and corrupt in her formes, but reſtiſied by vs, by calling it backe to her firſt rules, and by bringing it backe to her firſt vſage. So then there is no more queſtion of the calling: we are quit our with another for that point, let vs come to the doctrine, and to the examining thereof by the Scriptures.

(c) If the ſame why do they abiure it, and not only reſine it?

This concleuſion of *Monſieur du Pleſsis* doth ſhew, how gladly he would be quit of this queſtion of calling, knowing right wel that they can neuer ſatisfie therein, nor prooue themſelues true Paſtors, the want whereof doth neceſſarily inferre the want of the true church, true faith, and true religion. But let vs ſee how his authority alleaged by him ſerueth his turne in any point.

This conference was holden indeed, by the commandement of *Honorius* Emperor, but at the inſtance, and requeſt of the Catholique Biſhops, as appeareth by the Emperours owne letters. *For the deſire of peace and loue* (ſaith the Emperour) *we haue willingly*

Collat. 1. Carthag. art. 4.

yeelded

yeilded to the request of the venerable Bishops, who haue desired that the Donatist Bishops may be assembled, and that either part may make choice of certaine Bishops, by whose conference, or disputation, errour may be confuted.

This reaſon of this requeſt made to the Emperour, was the obſtinacy, and peruerſity of the Donatiſts, who hauing beene condemned before, both by eccleſiaſticall, and imperiall iudgement, did ſtill perſiſt in their error. Which obſtinacy moued the Catholique Biſhops, to ſeeke the ſecond time for the aſſiſtance of the ſecular power, whereby they might be conſtrayned to put in execution, the ſentence that ſhould be giuen againſt them. This I thought good to note, leaſt the leſſe skilfull reader might thinke, that either Chriſtian Emperours did take vpon them, the iudgement of Eccleſiaſtical cauſes, or that Catholique Biſhops did ſeeke vnto them for the ſame any farther then for their aſſiſtance for the execution of Eccleſiaſtical iudgment. And I could wiſh, good Reader, that for the better ſatisfaction, and fuller information, and knowledge of the nature of heretiques and ſchiſmatiques, thou wouldeſt take the paines, to read the whole conference it ſelfe, wherein thou ſhalt finde very many things for the proofe, and confirmation of the Catholike doctrin in the points controuerſed at this day, but no word againſt it, and ſee as it were in a glaſſe, the peruerſity of the heretiques of theſe our daies ſet downe, and recorded 1200 yeares agone, it is printed together with *Optatus Milenitanus: Ex Bibliopolio Commeliniano anno* 1599. my copie hath no other addreſſe. But to come to the obiection it ſelf, wherin *Monſi. du Pleſsis* vſeth his accuſtomed falſity, adding of his owne, and inuenting the ſayings of his authors, as he thinketh moſt for his purpoſe.

Ibid art. 54. Epiſt Catholicor. ad initium.

The true ſtate of the matter, for ſo much as appertayneth to this obiection is this.

The Donatiſts ſeeing themſelues not able to ſuſtaine, and make their partie good againſt the manifeſt truth forciblie vrged by the Catholiques, ſought all occaſions poſſible, to turne the diſpute from the point in controuerſie, and to ſpend the time in impertinent demands, that ſo they might (if it were poſſible) auoide the condemning ſentence, which they ſaw would fall vpon them.

The maine queſtion in controuerſie was, whether the fault or crime of *Cecilianus* and his collegues (ſuppoſing they were

trulie guiltie of any crime) might or ought to be ſo imputed to that church, whereof they were members, and which communicated with them; that it was now no more the true Catholique church, but a falſe and corrupt congregation of bad men, and therefore might iuſtlie be ſo abandoned by the Donatiſts, that they might reiect euen the ſacrament of Baptiſme giuen in it as vnlawfull.

The ſecond queſtion was, whether *Cecilianus* and his colleagues were indeed trulie guiltie of anie crime worthie of condemnation, or cenſure. That theſe were the maine queſtions in controuerſie, is euident by the mandate of the Catholiques, ſet downe in the firſt daies conference. The Catholiques maintayned and euidentlie proued the negatiue in both theſe queſtions, as appeareth in the whole conference, and alſo by the ſentence giuen accordinglie in the end of all.

Art. 54 45.

Collat. 3. Act. 216.

In the third daies conference *S. Auguſtine* hauing ſaid thus: *Cecilians cauſe hauing euer beene accuſtomed, to be obiected by the Donatiſts againſt the church, if they will now obiect it no more, what will they obiect againſt it? If they obiect nothing, why doe they ſeparate themſelues from it? If they obiect any thing elſe, let them propoſe it, let them ſhew it.*

Art. 227. Pet.

Art. 228. Aug.

Hereunto *Petilian* ſaith: *who art thou? art thou* Cecilians *ſonne, or no? art thou guilty of his crime, or no?*

Art. 229. Pet.

Art. 230. Aug.

Marke good Reader how impertinentlie theſe queſtions are moued, in reſpect of the matter in hand, and thou ſhalt eaſilie ſee, that the Catholike Biſhops had reaſon to ſay, that they were ſuperfluous, and pertained not to the cauſe, notwithſtanding *S. Auguſtin* anſwereth. *I am in the church, in which* Cecilian *was.*

Aliens and memorie of dead in S. Auguſtine his daies.

From whence haſt thou thy beginning? what father haſt thou? if thou condemne thy father, doſt thou not profeſſe thy ſelfe an heretique who will neither haue beginning, nor father?

Marke here the vniuerſalitie of the church.

VVe are in the church, wherein Cecilianus *did beare epiſcopall authoritie, and therein died. VVe recite his name at the Alter, we communicate with his memory, as with the memory of our brother, not of our Father or mother. Thou demandeſt of mee, whence my communion hath beginning. Our Lord Chriſt teſtifieth the beginning of my communion. It was neceſſary, that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and riſe againe from the dead the third day, and that penance and remiſſion of ſinnes ſhould be preached in his name, through all Nations beginning from Hieruſalem. From him not from the Church*

No mans faults ought to ſeperat vs from the vnitie of the church our mother.

my mother, no mans crime, nor no calumny shall seperate mee. Art. 231. Pet.

Cecilian *is he thy father, or mother as thou saiest?* Art. 232.

Thou hast already heard that he was my brother. Aug.

He is not a brother, that begetteth children. Art. 233.

Cecilian *is not my Father, if he be good, he is my good brother: If he be bad, he is my bad brother, yet because of the sacraments he is my brother whether good or bad.* Pet. Art. 234. Aug.

But if thou wouldest haue my opinion of him, I thinke him innocent and Art. 234.
sastly accused. If thou obiect his crimes against the church, I defend as a brother, and shew that they cannot belong to the Church, nor to the cause thereof, nor cannot hurt it. And so I shew, that thou obiect nothing against the Church, although the crimes of Cecilian *should be true, which thou canst no waies prooue. VVhich if thou canst not in like manner proue, thou seest where thou art; and what thou oughtest to embrace truth, and charity with vs, leauing thy obstinate errour.*

Let them say plainly at last, whether they haue Cecilian *instead of their* Art. 236.
father, from whom this issue is descended. For nothing can be borne without Pet.
some that begetteth it, not begin without a head, nor grow without a roote. Behold they often professe to haue no beginning. If therefore he haue no beginning, is not he rather an heretique, who hath no father, or who condemneth the father he hath?

I haue a head, but it is Christ. Art. 237.

VVho made thee Bishop? Aug.

I haue a head but it is Christ, whose Apostle saith, all things are yours, Art. 238.
but you are Christs, and Christ is Gods. And he afterward sheweth Pet. Art. 242.
at large out of the scriptures, how we haue but one father to Aug.
saluation, or that saueth vs, and yet how we haue diuers fathers Art. 243.
for other respects. Pet.

How is he called that ordayned him? let him tell who gaue him orders. Art. 244. Fortuna.

VVe doe not well conceiue, what it importeth to the cause of truth (that now is in hand) *who ordered euery Bishop, it is shewed by diuine testimony, that God is our father.*

Let him declare who ordered him. Art. 245. Pet.

Ordered whom? we are many present. Let the aduerse part speake, Art. 246.
whose ordination he asketh of, and why, that we may see, whether he be Alipius. Art. 247.
worthy of an wer. Adeodatus.

Augustin spake, let him tell who ordered him. Art. 248. Possidius.

VVee haue not taken vpon vs to defend Augustins *cause whatsoeuer* Art. 249.
he be.

 Aug.

I see superfluous things are demanded by our brethren of the contrary part, and yet I refuse not to answer to these superfluous demands, the churches cause whereunto nothing can be answered, being in safety. I whose ordination thou requirest, am a Christian, a faithfull beleeuer (which I speake God being my witnesse) a Catholique. I defend that Church, which, whatsoeuer I am, is a church. I see whereat thou aymest; thou seekest to calumniate, those things which you vse bragging to say, are not hidden to vs. Megalius *ordered me, the Primate of the Catholique church of Numidia, at that time when he had power to doe it. Behold I haue answered thee. Goe forward, propose that which thou hast prepared, and thou shalt be found a calumniator. I haue told thee my ordainer, now vttet the calumniations.*

Thus farre lasted this contestation, about *S. Austins* ordination and here it ended. I haue set it downe at large word for word for the better clearing of the obiection made out of it, which in truth is as impertinently vrged by *Monsieur du Plessis*, against the Catholiques inquiring of the Protestants vocation, as it was vsed by the Donatists, against their Catholique aduersaries. *S. Augustine*, and his Catholique partakers doe rightly reiect this demand of his ordination, as impertinent to the matter in hand. For had he beene ordered by *Cecilian* (as doubtlesse diuers Catholique Bishops were) yet before the Donatists could inferre any thing thereupon for their purpose, they were first to proue, that *Cecilians* faults were to be imputed, to the church, which communicated with him, which was the chiefe question in controuersie. Secondly, that *Cecilian* was truely guilty of the crimes obiected against him, which they were so farre from prooving, that the contrary was manifestly prooued by the Catholique party. Who doth not therefore see, that the question moued of *S. Augustines* ordination, was altogether impertinent to the matter, and therefore worthily reiected by the Catholike Bishops as such.

Now if *Monsieur du Plessis* can shew vs any such impertinency, in our demands of their ordination, or vocation, we will cease from molesting them any farther in that kinde. But we are warranted therein, by the testimonies of holie scripture, and ancient Fathers, and namly *S. Augustin* himselfe, euen against the Donatists, as is afore shewed: therefore must they not thinke to fobbe vs off with such fables, and make vs giue ouer our poursuit, till they either satisfie our demands, which they can neuer

Aboue n. 20.

doe

doe: or yeeld to the euident truth, and returne to the vnitie, and charitie of Gods holy Church, which I pray God they may soone doe.

The mith Chapter.

Not all externall ordination, or consecration by such as beare the name, and pretend to be Bishops is a sufficient and true calling to the ministerie of Gods word and sacraments.

1. HAVING in the precedent chapters refuted diuers sorts of callings, which either are maintayned by some Protestants, or may any waies be imagined to be probable, it remayneth to cleare the question heere proposed, concerning the lawfulnes of the calling of the protestant clergie of England. Where first it is to be obserued, that (by the confession of those aduersaries, with whom we haue here to dispute) the ordinations made by the Bishops of the Romane Church, are sufficient for the true constitution of ecclesiasticall ministers. To which acknowledgment they are constrained by necessitie, nor hauing any other possible meanes, to maintaine that ordinarie calling, which they pretend to haue. The question therfore is not here, whether the ordinations made by the Bishops of the Romane Church be sufficient or no, this being confessed, and without controuersie. But whether the ordinations made by other Bishops, from the communion of the Romane Church, and namely by those of England, be such or no.

Secondly it is to be obserued, that though hitherto hath bene sufficientlie impugned the ministerie of the pretended reformation of France, and such other falsly named Churches, as agree with it in the extraordinary calling of their ministers, as that of Scotland, and Geneua, with whom aggree our English puritanes yet because there are other Protestant Churches, which chalenge to themselues another kind of calling, then that of France: therfore to impugne directly, and effectuallie the same, it is necessarie, to enter into a particuler dispute with

them. And becauſe the Proteſtants in England haue moſt alwaies of an ordinarie calling, and beare themſelues more boldly therupon (as *M. Maſon* in his epiſtle declareth in theſe words) *VVheras other reformed churches were conſtrayned by neceſsitie, to admit extraordinarie Fathers, that is to receiue ordination from presbyters, which are but inferiour miniſters, rather then to ſuffer the fabricke of our Lord Ieſus to be diſſolued: the church of England had alwaies Biſhops to conferre ſacred orders, according to the ordinarie, and moſt warrantable cuſtome of the church of Chriſt.* Therfore hereafter I will diſpute with them. And if by force of argument it be made apparent, that they alſo want all lawfull calling, there can no doubt remaine of all the reſt of the Proteſtants Churches, of what reformation ſoeuer they may bragge. The meaning therfore of the queſtion here propoſed is, whether thoſe that beare the names of Biſhops in England, be true Biſhops and haue any true power to conſecrate, or ordaine the lawfull miniſters of Gods church, or no. And to prooue that they haue, *Monſieur Maſon* hath publiſhed a large volume, which I intend not to refute by way of anſwer, but by poſſitiue argument to impugne that which he would maintayne. For thou art to obſerue (Iudicious reader) that *M. Maſons* grounds (for maintenante of their calling) are but anſweres, to ſuch arguments and obiections, as he himſelfe frameth againſt it (as is already noted in the preface:) If therfore any one of all thoſe arguments, be maintayned good againſt him (as not only one, but many, God willing, ſhall be) he will find his dawbing like vnto that, wherof the Prophet ſpeaketh, *Dic illis, qui liniunt abſq; temperatura, quòd caſurus ſit.* Tell them that dawbe without tempering, that it will fall. But to come to the matter it ſelfe.

The meaning of the preſent queſtion.

Ezech. 13. 11.

This deduction he maketh pa. 10. and is the ſole ground of all his booke.

2. All that *Monſieur Maſon* ſaith in his great booke in ſumme is this. The Biſhops that new are in England were ordained, by other Biſhops their predeceſſours, and thoſe by others, vntill we come to *Thomas Cranmer*, who was ordained by Biſhops of the Romane Church. Therfore the Biſhops now in England are true Biſhops, and conſequently haue true power, to ordaine lawfull miniſters of Gods word, and ſacraments. If this were ſurely and ſolidly prooued, or maintained, as it is eaſely ſaid, *M. Maſon* would deſerue immortall praiſe, with equall thankes for hauing deliuered his Fathers Biſhops, and brethren [illegible] miniſters

niſters fro that difficultie of the proofe of their calling, wherin they are ſo farre from ſatisfying their aduerſaries, that they themſelues reſt not ſatisfied therin. For it is not ten yeares ſince one of their Biſhops, in priuate conference with others of his owne ranke, and confident freinds is knowne to haue confeſſed this. *The french miniſters haue no meanes at all, to proone their calling, and we in England can hardly proue ours.* Therfore if *M. Maſon* performe this taſcke that he hath vndertaken, dexterouſly, he ſhall doubtles deſerue well of them all. And becauſe ordination, or conferring of holy orders, (wherby true, and lawfull calling is giuen) may be defectiue three manner of waies, to wit, either of the part of him that doth ordaine, or of him that is ordayned, or of the ordination it ſelfe, it belongeth to *M. Maſon* to proone, or at leaſt maintaine that the ordinations of the Biſhops in England, from Archbiſhop *Cranmer*, be not defectiue in any one of theſe reſpects, for if they faile in one of them, they cannot be true Biſhops, and much leſſe if they faile in them all, as I thinke they wilbe found to doe. But before we enter into the particuler examination of *M. Maſons* doctrine in this point, I will wiſh thee, good Reader, to obſerue two or three things, ſuppoſing in the meane while theſe ordinations to be good, in all the three reſpects now mentioned.

3. Firſt, that if the ordinations of our ſuppoſed English Biſhops be not otherwiſe canonicall, but only by reaſon of the ſucceſſion they pretend to haue, from Archbiſhop *Cranmer* it *Note.* muſt neceſſarilie follow, that all other pretended Churches, as that of *France*, *Germanie*, *Geneua*, *Scotland*, and the reſt that haue no ſuch ſucceſſion, haue no lawfull miniſterie. For if the ordination of our English Biſhops be good, only becauſe it is deriued by ſucceſſion from *Cranmer* who was a true Biſhop, thoſe Churches, that haue no ſuch ſucceſſion, can haue no ſuch ordination, and conſequently no lawfull miniſters or Paſtors. Whence farther it alſo followeth, that they can haue no lawfull Church, which cannot be without lawfull Paſtors, as is confeſſed aſwell by Proteſtants as Catholiques. And yet farther that of all the reformed Churches, there is no one true, but only that of England, and therfore the Church of Chriſt, which ſhould be Catholique or vniuerſall, as *M. Maſon* him ſelf proueth by this cleare profecie: *I will giue the Heathen for thin inheritance, and*

the vttermoſt ports of the earth for thy poſſeſſion muſt needs be drawne within the compaſſe of England, which is more ridiculouſly abſurd then the condemned doctrine of the Donatiſts, who affoorded the church a for larger compaſſe. Which abſurditie wilbe more apparent, if we conſider the ſmal number of the English themſelues, that hold the calling of their miniſters to be canonicall. For ſeparating firſt the Catholiques, who eſteeme the Proteſtants ordinations, but an apish imitation of the Catholique conſecrations, and then the *Puritans*, *Browniſts*, and the reſt that condemne the ſame as papiſticall, there will remayne no great number, to make vp the glorious kingdome of the ſonne of God, who *hath the whole world giuen him by his father for his inheritance.* as *M. Maſon* acknowledgeth.

Pſal. 2. 8. 4. This euident deduction cannot be poſſibly auoided, but by one of theſe two waies: to wit, either that the ordinations of the other reformed Churches, are all one with them of the Church of England; or els that there are diuers ſorts of canonicall ordinations of Paſtors in the Church of Chriſt. And yet both theſe are euidently falſe. For to begin with the latter, where is it read in holy ſcripture, or other authenticall record, that either our Sauiour Chriſt ordained, or his Apoſtles practiſed diuers ſorts, or fashions of ordinations in his Church? Surely no where. And ſeeing this is a point of principall moment, as being the firſt thing required in the building of Gods houſe, nothing ought to be affirmed therin without euident warrant, eſpecially by our newly reformed maſters, who pretend to reduce all things, to the ſquare of the written word it ſelfe. But yet we will deale more liberallie with them, then to ty them ſo ſtrictly to the ſcriptures, and wilbe content to take for good ſatisfaction, one only inſtance of practiſe, not with in the firſt fiue hundred yeares after Chriſt, as they exact of vs in other points, but within the whole fifteene hundred yeares, one allowed and approoued inſtance I ſay, of any other ſort of ordination of Paſtors in the Church, but by the viſible and ſenſible impoſition of hands by Bishops, Which notwithſtanding they are not able to produce. Falſe therfore and abſurd it is to imagine, that there are diuers ſorts, of ordinarie callings of Paſtors (for of ordinarie calling we ſpeake here) hauing already ſufficiently refuted all pretence of extraordinarie.

5. Neith-

5. Neither is the first euasion (to wit that the ordinations of the church of England, and of France are all one) lesse false. For where there is not one and the same formall cause, there cannot be the same effect: but in the ordinations of Pastors in the English, and French Churches, there is not the same formall cause, for in the English it is the power of a Bishop (at least as is pretended) which is not in the French church; therfore cannot the effect, or ordinance be all one. For to say that the power of Priests, and Bishops is all one in respect of ordination, is an heresie cõdemned 1200. yeares agoe in *Aerius*, as is already shewed. And though some of our new masters would inferre, that Priests haue the same power to ordaine, that Bishops haue, vpon the opinion of some schoolemen, teaching that the character of Priests, and Bishops are all one: yet are they euidently conuinced, either not to vnderstand the schoolemen, or guilfully to dissemble their doctrine. For those schoolemen that teach, that the character of priesthood, and Bishophood to be all one, do also teach, that the same character is extended in Bishops, by their consecrations to certaine actions, and namely to the giving of priesthood, wherunto it is not extended in Preists, and this not by any positiue decree, or ordinance of the church, but by Christs owne institution. Wherfore it is most manifest, that if the whole doctrine of these schoolemen be expressed, (as it must be, if any one will inferre any thing of their opinion) it maketh directly against this heresie, of the equalitie of Priests and Bishops, in respect of ordination of Pastors: but of this matter is spoken largly aboue cap. 7. n. 6.

Doct. Morton and D. Field.

6. Againe though this equalitie of Priests and Bishops were (against the truth) graunted, yet would it nothing helpe them in the question now in hand, to wit, whether the ordinations of the English, and French Churches be all one: it being cleare, that the French Churches do not receiue, or admit of the ordinations made by Priests; but if any Priests run out of the Catholique Church to them, they ordeyne them a new (if they thinke them worthie of their ministerie) so farre are they from receiuing ordinations made by Preists. For which reason doubtles do our English Puritans esteeme so vily of ordinations made by Bishops, as we shall by and by heare out of M. Whitaker

and *M. Fulke*. Yea *Caluin* the firſt founder of the French Churches, (and therfore are they not very ancient) was himſelfe no Prieſt, yet did he ordaine miniſters, not in vertue of any prieſthood (which he had not, and which his ſchollers blaſphemouſly tearme the marke of the beaſt,) but as hauing power, not only to preach, but alſo to ordaine miniſters immediatlie from God, and not by any ſucceſſion of ordination deriued vnto him, by the impoſition of hands of prieſthood.

From all which I conclude thus. The Church of England hath a different ordination of Paſtors, from the churches of France, and all other churches, that haue not their miniſters ordayned by Biſhops: therfore hath it alſo a different miniſterie: of a different miniſterie followeth neceſſarilie a different Church (which is nothing but the people vnited with their Paſtors, as *S. Cyprian* defineth it) but of two different Churches, the one at leaſt muſt needs be the Synagogue of *Satan*, (for Chriſt hath but one Church) I ſay at leaſt one; for they may well be both ſo: truth in euerie thing being but one, wheras falſitie may be infinite. Whence *M. Maſon* may ſee how ill he deſerueth his name: For labouring to make vp the breach in their church, by prooving the calling of their Biſhops by ſucceſſion from the church of Rome, he hath made it much greater, by ſeparating their Church from all their hitherto pretended ſiſter Churches, and therby making it to ſtand alone, without communion with any other Church in the whole world (the euident brand of a ſchiſmaticall conuenticle.) For the communion, which is required to the vnitie of the church, is not the ſole agreement in ſome points of Chriſtian beliefe, for ſo all Chriſtians, be they *Anabaptiſts*, *Arrians*, or other heretiques whatſoeuer, ſhould be all of one Church (which notwithſtanding no man of common ſenſe will ſay,) but the agreement muſt be in all points of faith, and principallie in the lawfull calling and cõſtitution of Paſtors, which is as it were the roote, and foundation of all communion, *S. Paul* ſaying, *How can they preach, vnles they be ſent?* and therfore euerie difference or diuerſitie therin, maketh a greather difference in the whole building.

Epiſt. ad Florẽtium.

Rom. 10.

See the doctrin of the French miniſters of this matter cap. 8. §. 13. & 14.

Secondly it is to be obſerued, that thoſe that hold the Pope to be that ſpeciall Antichriſt foretold in the holy ſcriptures, and therfore beleeue the Biſhops of the Romane Church

to be promoters for Antichrist, and not Pastors of Christs flocke, must necessarilie also hold, that *Cranmer* ordained by them was no lawfull Bishop. For that great Antichrist being by the vniforme consent of all Christians, the most opposite enemie of Christ that can be imagined, it cannot enter into any sensible mans vnderstanding, that he can or will minister any power so necessarie, and so directlie seruing for the glorie of Christ, as the true ordination of Pastors doth. And much lesse can it be imagined, that our Sauiour Christ, the wisdome of his Father, should leaue the power of ordayning necessarie Pastors of his flocke (so dearelie purchased by him) in the hands of his enemie in such sort, as the true ministers of his Gospell should be forced to go to him, or his proctors, for their warrant and commission to preach his truth, and minister his sacraments to the people redeemed with his most pretious bloud. What calling therfore could *Cranmer* receiue of the Bishops of the Romane Church, in the opinion of these men, who notwithstanding thinke themselues to haue the spirit of God? Surely no true calling, or commission to preach the Gospell of Christ, and minister his sacraments, but rather the marke of the beast to destroy his Church and kingdome.

Du Plessis and the French ministers mentioned aboue ground their extraordinarie vocatiõ here vpon.

And for this reason, do the Churches of the pretended reformation in France, and elswhere, absolutely disclaime from all calling, receiued from the Bishops of the Romane Church: deriuing their vocation from themselues, without all succession to any predecessors, conformable to the rest of their doctrine: The *Caluinists* in France in the profession of their faith, testifying their calling to be extraordinarie, confirming the same by their practise, by ordayning anew such Priests, as reuolt from the Catholique Church to their congregation, yea (and which is more) making them to abiure their orders receiued before, as the verie marke of Antichrist. The Sacramentaries of *Basil* vpon the same ground, stiled their first peruerter *Oecolampadius*, their first Bishop. And *M. Whitaker* to the same purpose saith. *I would not haue you thinke we make such reckening of your orders, as to hold our owne vocation vnlawfull without them, and therfore kepe them to your selues.* And *M. Fulke* more plainly: *You are highly deceiued, if you thinke we esteeme*

Confess. artic. 27.

Con. Dureū pag. 812.

answere to a counterfaite Catholique pag. 50. Pag. 67. Cap. 11. pag. 365. 366.

your offices of Bishops, Prieſts, and Deacons better then lay men. And in his retentiue. With all our hart we deſie, abhorre, deteſt, and ſpit at your ſtinking, greaſie, Antichriſtian orders. And if *Monſieur du Pleſſis* with *M. Maſon* contrariwiſe deriue their miniſters, from the Romane Church, ſaying, *that they haue the ſame calling and ſucceſſion, which they* (Catholikes) *ſo much bragg of and that their firſt Paſtors were Priſts, Curates, and Doctors of diuinitie.* This contradiction amongſt them yea of *Monſieur du Pleſſis* with him ſelf is not ſo much to be maruciled at, the difficultie of this matter wherof they can neuer find any ſufficient ſolution, forcing them to turne, and wind vp and downe, now affirming, now denying one and the ſame thing, as the preſent occaſion requireth, that they may by ſo many windings, if it be poſſible, looſe their aduerſarie, or at leſt ſo dazle the eyes of the vnwarie reader, that he ſhall not eaſely ſee the abſurdities they are driuen vnto, in defending their hereſies. For being preſſed from whence they come, and who ſent them: leaſt they ſhould be diſcouered to come without ſending (the euident marke of theeues, and falſe Prophets) they anſwere, we come from the ſame ſtocke and fountaine, that the Biſhops of the Romane Church do come, for our firſt Paſtors were ordayned Prieſts by them: And being vrged with the impoſſibilitie, of receiuing any lawfull calling from the Pope, whom they beleeue to be Antichriſt, or from the Biſhops of the Romane Church, who they teach to be Antichriſts proctors: they anſwere, that they receiue no calling from him or them, but extraordinarilie and immediatelie from God, ſo that one while they will receiue their calling from the Romane Church, and other while they will haue none from thence, but deteſt, abhorre, and ſpit at all their ordinations as Antichriſtian.

This dealing is euidently ſeene in du Pleſſis and the French miniſters before cited.

Which ſecond reſolution if we follow, (as it is the doctrine of the farre greater part of the Churches falſly called reformed) euerie one ſeeth, how litle it auaileth to a lawfull calling, to haue bene ordered by the Biſhops of the Romane Church, and to be deſcinded by ſucceſſion from them. So that though *M. Maſon* ſhould prooue, that their Biſhops ſucceede ours, yet ſhall he be farther from the proofe of their lawfull calling (euen by the iudgment of his owne reformed brethren) then he was before: and therfore whileſt he laboreth to proone their diſcent from

our Bishops, he laboureth quite against himselfe, vnlesse he will leaue, and disclaime from the society of his reformed brethren, who yet esteeme themselues better Christians then he.

8. And if *M. Mason* will say, that these men exceed in this point, and that therefore their doctrine in this particuler is not receiuable, I will admit it for an answer, not intending to make their Apology, though I know it will little content, and lesse satisfie them. But let them dispute thereupon one against another, till they either driue out all light of reason from both their vnderstandings, and so become blinde Atheists, towards which downefall they are farre slidden already, or else till they haue vomited out all their malice, against the Catholique Church, whereby they are become so blind, as they can neither see the *cleare burning lampe set vpon the candle-sticke*, nor *the city mounted vpon the height of hils*. Let them I say dispute together vpon this point of their calling, or manner of deriuing it from the Apostles, to themselues, whileſt I touch a little nearer *M. Masons* owne doctrine: to which purpose.

9. It is thirdly to be obserued, that *M. Mason* holding the Pope to be Antichrist at least in that generall sense, and vnderstanding, that all heretiques are Antichrists, and consequently, the Bishops of the Roman churches communicating with the Pope to be also heretiques, cannot with any probability hold, that *Cranmer* receiuing his calling and ordination from them, could by vertue thereof be a lawfull Bishop. Which that it may appeare euidently to euery one: It is to be vnderstood, that for the giuing of lawfull calling or ordination, two things are required in him that doth ordaine (omitting for the present that, which is required in him that is ordayned, and in the ordination it self) The one is the sacramentall power of Episcopall order, which in the true and Catholique doctrine, is an indeleble and incorruptible character, and marke imprinted in his soule, when he was ordayned, by vertue of the like character in his soule, that did ordayne him. The other is the lawfull authority, to vse and exercise the same power of orders. So that without these two things, no man can giue to another lawfull calling or ordination. Yet is there a great difference betweene them. For the first is so absolutly necessary, that vnlesse the ordayner haue it, he giueth nothing at all to him, whom he should ordaine,

If the Pope be not Antichrist, they are heretikes that teach him so to be: therfore they that communicate with them as our English Protestants doe, are at least fellowes of heretiques. Math. 5. 14. 15. Esay 2. 2.

who therefore remayneth ſtill a meere Lay-man, as he was before: both of them committing ſacriledge, by their preſumptuous attempt in that behalfe. The ſecond is not neceſſary, that the ordained may receiue the character, or ſacramentall power of order, but only that he may together with the order, receiue the lawfull vſe and exerciſe thereof, ſo that hee that ſhould be ordayned by one that wanteth the firſt, muſt be ordayned againe, ere he can be Prieſt or Bishop, whereas being ordayned by one wanting only the ſecond, is not to be reordayned, but only to receiue that he wanteth, which is the lawfull exerciſe of the order receiued.

10. Let not (iudicious Reader) theſe words *character* or *Sacramentall power* breed any ſcruple in thee, as though the doctrine here deliuered were ſo builded thereupon, as without them it could not ſtand. For though it be true, that holy order is a ſacrament, and that alſo it leaueth in the ſoule of the ordayned an indeleble character, yet doth not this otherwiſe import to the queſtion here in hand, then only to ſhew, that a certaine power is required in him, that ordayneth another in the degree of Prieſt or Bishop, without which the ordayned ſhould receiue nothing (which power whether it be a ſacrament, or leaue in the ordayned any character, or no, importeth nothing to this preſent queſtion.) And this doctrine is neceſſarily receiued of all parts. For it is vnpoſſible, that one ſhould receiue any thing of another, vnleſſe the other haue power to giue it. Yea the Catholique doctrine teaching an indeleble character, giuen in Holie Orders, doth much more aduantage my aduerſarie, in the queſtion now in hand, then doth the contrary, as will appeare by and by.

For if we ſhould ſuppoſe with the Proteſtants, that holy order leaueth no permanent power in him that is ordayned, by vertue whereof, the actions which he doth in his function, are made of more force and valour, then the ſame actions done by one, that neuer was ordered, it is vnpoſible to conceiue, how an hereticall Bishop ſhould giue lawfull calling becauſe according to this doctrine, he himſelfe can haue no more authority to ordayne another, then he that neuer was ordayned at all. But of this we ſhall haue occaſion to ſpeake more hereafter.

the meane while for the more aduantage of mine aduerſarie, I will ſuppoſe the Catholique doctrine in this point. And ſay notwithſtanding that M. *Maſon* holding the Pope, and all the Bishops of the Roman Church to be heretiques, cannot with any probability hold the ordination, and calling of *Cranmer* receiued from them, to be good or canonicall.

11. For though he receiued of them the epiſcopall character neceſſarily required to lawfull calling, yet if his ordayners were heretiques (as in *Maſter Maſons* opinion they were) he could not receiue of them, the lawfull vſe of the ſame character, and Epiſcopal power (they themſelues not hauing it) which notwithſtanding is alſo neceſſary to lawfull calling, as is already ſaid. This will neceſſarily follow in Maſter *Maſons* doctrine, vpon the proofe of theſe two points. Firſt, that to the deliuery of lawfull calling, is required in him that ordayneth, not only the power of order, but alſo the lawfull vſe and exerciſe thereof. Secondly, that the lawfull vſe and exerciſe of this power is loſt, or taken away by hereſie. Theſe two things being prooued, it will neceſſarily follow I ſay that *Cranmer* had no lawfull calling in Maſter *Maſons* opinion, who eſteemeth the Pope, and all the Bishops of the Roman church to be heretiques.

12. The firſt of theſe two points is prooued, by the practice of our Sauiour himſelfe, who gaue his Apoſtles the power of order, before hee gaue them authority to vſe it which doth shew, that theſe two powers are diſtinct the one from the other, and alſo that they are both neceſſarie to lawfull calling. At his laſt ſupper hee gaue them power, to celebrate the holy miſteries (I doe not ſay to ſacrifice his true bodie, though this alſo be true, becauſe I will not heere inuolue that controuerſie being not neceſſarie to this queſtion) ſaying: *Doe yee this for commemoration of mee*: and after his reſurrection, adioyned hereunto, the power to remit ſinnes, ſaying vnto them. *Receiue yee the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſinnes you ſhall forgiue, they are forgiuen*: Yet did hee not giue them Commiſſion to vſe this power, at leaſt euerie where, till immediately before his Aſcenſion when hee ſaied thus vnto them. *All power is giuen to mee in Heauen, and in Earth, goeing therefore teach yee all Nations,*

Luc. 22. 19.

Io. 20. 22, 23

Math. 20. 18, 19, 20.

tions, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost, teaching them to obserue all things whatsoeuer I haue commanded you. And againe: *Going into the whole world, preach the Gospell to*
Marc.16.15. *all creatures.* Hereby it is euident, that the power of order, and the power of the lawfull vse thereof, which vsually is called the power of iurisdiction, are two distinct things, in such sort, as that the first may be without the latter, which is also proued
Act.11.3. by the expostulation which the disciples had with *S. Peter*, for preaching and baptizing the Gentils; which (till they vnderstood by him the warrant he had from God) they thought he had no commission to doe, though they well knew his Apostleship.

The same verity is also confirmed by the commission, which
Math. 10.5. 6.7. the Apostles had to preach amongst the Iewes before our Sauiours Passion, and prohibition to preach to others, shewing
Marc.6.7.8. Luc.9.1. that albeit the power of order be alwaies one and the same, yet the lawfull vse thereof, and power of iurisdiction may be restrayned, or amplified, suspended or quite taken away, as pleaseth him, that is the author thereof.

14. The example that may be taken from ciuill gouernement doth make this yet more plaine. For the King when he maketh Magistrates and Officers of the Kingdome, as for example Iudges, he giueth them his letters patents, whereby they are created iudges. Yet for all that can they not vse, or exercise this office ouer the Kings subiects, without a speciall warrant, or commission enabling them thereunto. Which commission if either it expire, or be taken from them, or be suspended, they may still remaine iudges hauing their patent, but they cannot vse or exercise the office. And for this reason both the power of order, which is giuen by consecration, or ordination, and the indicatory power giuen by patent, may fitly be called after the fashion of Schoole-men, *potestas in actu primo* (that is) a power fit or able (when the vse and exercise thereof is granted) to doe such and such actions, and not otherwaies. Nature also it selfe affordeth examples explayning this truth. For though the fire haue power and actiuity to heat, yea and burne, yet can it doe neither vnlesse it be applied to that, which it should heat or burne.

From all which it is euidentlie concluded, that the sole po-

vere of order in any Bishop, without the lawfull authority to vse it, is not sufficiēt to giue lawfull calling. And therfore though it be confessed, that the ordainers of *Cranmer* had the true power of order, yet is not that sufficient to proone, that they gaue him lawfull calling, which without the lawfull power to vse their orders, they could not giue. Wherfore it now remaineth, that we examine the second point proposed, whether the orderers of *Cranmer* had togither with the power of order the lawfull vse thereof. And certaine it is, that in *M. Masons* opinion they had it not. For in his opinion they were heretiques, and consequentlie had lost all power of iurisdiction, and lawfull vse of their orders, as is plainly the doctrine and practise of the Catholique Church aboue 1200. yeares agone, as appeareth by most irreproouable testimonies.

15. First the *Arians* accusing the Catholique Bishops of heresie, in like manner as the Protestants now doe the Bishops of the Catholique Romane Church, notwithstanding that their first Bishops were ordained by them, as also the first Protestant Bishops were, are vrged by *S. Athanasius* in this sort. *By what right can they be Bishops, if they receiued their ordination from heretiques, as they them selues accuse them to be?* And in another place, speaking in the person of *Iulius* Pope, he saith: *It is impossible that the ordinations made by* Secundus *being an Arian could haue any force in the Catholike church.* *S. Hilarie* argueth in the like manner and saith. *VVhat will become of vs, that bring the matter to this passe, that because they* (his predecessors) *were not Bishops, we also are not, for we are ordained by them, and are their successours. Let vs renounce our Episcopat, because we receiued it of excommunicate persons.* This he saith to certayne Bishops that indirectlie obiected heresie to the Catholique Bishops of the councell of *Nice* their predecessours *S. Hierome* also protesteth, that *there are now* (speaking of his owne time) *no Bishops in all the world, but those that were ordained by the councell of Nice*, vnderstanding those that did communicate with the fathers of that councell. Whereby it is euidēt, that he esteemed the heretiques no Bishops, though they had bene ordained by the Catholique Bishops.

In epist. de concilijs Arim. & Seleuc. §. Quæ autem Seleuciæ: post mediū. Apol. 2. epist. Iulij. De Synodis con. Arianos, ad finem.

Con. Luciferian.

Secondly heretiques publiquelie knowne, and declared to be such, are excommunicate, and cut of from all vnion, and communion with the Church, *S. Paul* giuing sentence against them, saying: *A man that is an heretique, after the first, and second admonition*

Tit. 3. 10.

monition auoide. And our Sauiour him selfe: he that will not heare the Church (of which sort are all heretiques) let him be to thee as a publican and heathen, but he that is excommunicate, and cut of from the body of the Church, can haue no lawfull power to minister in the Church, as is euident of it selfe. And *Tertullian* deduceth it in this sort. *If they be heretiques, they cannot be Christians, if not Christians, they can haue no right to the scriptures of Christians*: the same may be said of the power to ordaine others in the Church. So that by the iudgment of the auncient Church, of *S. Paul* yea and our Sauiour him selfe it is euident, that heretiques can haue no lawfull power, to ordaine ministers of Christs word and sacraments. Whence is necessarilie deduced, that *Cranmer* in *M. Masons* doctrine could be no lawfull Bishop or minister, because he was ordained by none, but such as he esteemeth heretiques. When *M. Mason* shall plaster vp this breache (standing in his owne doctrine) I shall esteeme him a master in his art and that he daubeth clenly in deed.

Mat. 18. 17. de præscriptione. *Of heretiques and gentiles we are to speake in the same fashion:* Hiero. contra Luciferia: ad initium.

16. But *M. Mason* hath yet one shift more, before he receiue the checke mate. For he will say, that albeit *Cranmer* was ordayned by Bishops of the Romane Church, who, as he thinketh, were heretiques, and therfore could not receiue any lawfull power, to deriue his orders or calling vnto others, as is alreadie shewed; yet hauing by their ordination receiued the power of order, as before is confessed; he might without any great difficultie recouer also the lawfull power, to vse the same, by being admitted to the cõmunion of other Bishops lawfullie ordained, as is manifest by the practise of the Church, both auncient and moderne in absoluing from excommunication, and reconciling to the vnitie of the Church, such as were before excommunicate and seperated from the same. But this shift doth not auoide, the conclusion made against him. For first this euasion in *M. Masons* doctrine, who admitteth no character left in the soule of him that is ordained, (for example in him that ordained *M. Cranmer*) hath no shew of probabilitie at all. For if the ordination once past, nothing do remaine in the ordained, if by excommunication he loose the right and power, which he receiued, how can it be imagined, that he may receiue the same power without a new ordination? But as I said before, I will giue *M. Mason* leaue to helpe himselfe out of this mire, by the hold he may take of the Catholique doctrine in this

this point. In which it is nothing hard to conceiue, how a Bishop, or Prieſt excommunicate, may be reſtored to his former orders, or rather to the lawfull vſe of them, without any newe ordination. The Catholique doctrine teacheth, that holy order leaueth an incorruptible marke in the ordayned, which remayning, the power of order doth euer remaine, and therfore nothing appertaining to that function can be wanting in him, but only the right, auctoritie and power lawfullie to vſe it, which may eaſily be recouered without any reordination, by the ſole remouall of the impediment, wherby he is hindered from the communion of the Church. But all this helpeth nothing *M. Maſon*, ſo deſperate is his caſe. For *Cranmer* wanting true calling, by reaſon of that defect of hereſie found in his ordainers (as *M. Maſon* will) it is vnpoſſible for him to find a ſuplie of this defect, and therfore muſt he neceſſarilie remaine, without true calling for euer. And the reaſon hereof is euident, becauſe this defect cannot be taken awaie, but by the reunion, and reconciliation of *Cranmer* to the body of the true Church, and the true Catholique Biſhops. But this was abſolutelie vnpoſſible, becauſe beſides the Church of Rome, and the Catholique Romane Biſhops, there were none in the whole world, of whom he could receiue this reconciliation. For to ſay, that there were other Proteſtant Churches alreadie founded before *Cranmers* reuoult, to which he might be reunited and reconciled, is too too idle to be alleaged, the caſe of thoſe Churches being the ſame with that of England, and worſe, as is before ſhewed: wherfore to recurre vnto them for helpe in this point, is like as if a lame cripple ſhould craue help ouer a ſtile, of another that is both blind, and lame. There were indeed other Churches ſeparated from that of Rome, long before *Luthers* apoſtacie, as that of the *Ethiopians*, *Grecians*, *Ruſſians*, and others; but to none of all theſe did our new reformers vnite themſelues, differing as farre from them, as they do from the Catholique Romane: and therfore doth there remaine no meane of their reconciliation to any church, wherby they might recouer that, which they wanted of lawfull calling.

17. Hauing thus euidentlie ſhewed (as I thinke) that albeit it ſhould be graunted, that our now English ſuperintendents haue their calling from the Catholique Biſhops, that went

before them, yet they cannot in their owne doctrine be esteemed to haue true calling. And farther though they should be graunted to haue true calling, by reason of their pretended succession; yet would this rather destroy, then edifie their Church, because it doth euidentlie separate them from all other Churches, and therfore doth constitute them, a manifest schismaticall conuenticle, and depriueth them of all appearance of a true Church: hauing, I say, sufficientlie shewed this, I would here make an end of my dispute with *Monsieur Mason*, as hauing alreadie frustrated the whole drift of his booke (which is to make good their vocation, and therby to cleare their Church from a principall defect euer obiected against it) were it not, that he, to wind himselfe out of the difficultie last mentioned, laboureth to shew, how their calling may be good and canonicall, though it be deriued from that of the Romane Church, which in his opinion is Antichristian, and wicked, and therby prouoketh me to proceed yet farther with him, in this same argument. And because our contestation is like to be somewhat prolixe, that it may not be ouer irkesome or redious to the reader, I will separate it from that, which is alreadie said of that matter, and handle it vnder this title.

The tenth Chapter.

The calling of the now English superintendents cannot be lawfull, supposing, that of the Bishops of the Romane church, from which it is taken, to be vnlawfull.

1. THIS in substance is the title of the 12. chapter of *M. Masons* fifth booke, who purteth downe his discourse by way of a Dialogue between *Philodox* bearing the person of a Romane Catholique, and *Orthodox* representing (as *M. Mason* will haue it) an English Protestant. I will not quarrell with him for miscalling himselfe, but I will leaue it to *Didimus* a third interlocutor, to conuince him of theft, (if it be theft to take that, which is another mans without his consent.) *Philodox* therfore and

Ortho-

Orthodox ſhall ſpeake, as Maſter *Maſon* will haue them, but *Didimus* as truth ſhall teach him.

Well I perceiue one thing, that howſoeuer you ſpeake againſt Popiſh Prieſts calling them ſacrilegious, and abominable, yet when your owne calling is put to the triall, you are glad to deriue it from ſuch Biſhops, as were Popiſh Prieſts, which you ſo diſdainfully call ſacrilegious, and abominable. Philodox.

And I perceiue another thing, that howſoeuer you exclaim againſt Cranmer as a ſchiſmatique, and burned him for an heretique: yet when the glorious ſucceſſion of your Biſhops in Queene Maries *time is put to triall, you are forced to deriue it frō him, whō you ſcornfully cal a ſchiſmatique, & heretique.* Orthodox.

No verily *Orthodox*, you cannot inferre any ſuch thing againſt *Philodox*, as he vrgeth againſt you, the caſe being nothing like. For *Philodox* doth not eſteeme the Prieſt-hood, or Biſhop-hood of *Cranmer* to be ſacrilegious and abominable, but good, holy, and the ſame Catholique order, that is in their Biſhops; and therefore no inconuenience followeth againſt him, though their Biſhops in Queene *Maries* time deriue their ſucceſſion from *Cranmer*, or (truer) by *Cranmer*. And though *Cranmer* falling into hereſie loſt the power, and authority to vſe lawfully his orders, and therefore could not giue lawfull calling, which includeth not only the power of order, but alſo the lawfull vſe thereof: yet might this defect be eaſily ſupplied in theſe, whom he ordayned after the Catholique rite (of whom only I ſpeake here, for the ordayned by him in King Edwards time, there is a great difference as we ſhall ſee in due place) by their reconciliation to the Catholique church, and abſolution from all eccleſiaſticall cenſure or other impediment: which was done in the beginning of Queene *Maries* raigne, as you your ſelfe relate out of *Sanders*. I ſuppoſe you are too well reade in antiquity, to doubt of the truth of this doctrine, and practiſe in the ancient church yet leaſt you ſhould haue any ſcruple therein, I wiſh you ſhould take the paines to ſee the places quoted in the margent. Didimus.

Now you (*Orthodox*) cannot ſay this in iuſtification of yur calling. For firſt you eſteem the Prieſt-hood of the Roman church whence you would deriue your calling, ſacrilegious, idolatrous, Antichriſtian, and abominable, and therefore muſt of neceſſity make your owne which you ſay is deriued from it as bad. Secondly, you had no Catholique church going before you, and extant, when your firſt Paſtors ran out, by reconciliation whereunto

Maſon p. 79.
S. Hierome contra Luciferi. ſatis ante finem.
Theod. l. 1. c. 9. hiſt.
Concilium Nicen. 1. can. 8.
Tharaſius in Nicen. 2. act. 1.

unto, *Cranmer* and the rest might receiue that, which they must of necessity want in their calling (if the Bishops who ordered them were heretiques) but are truly such, as *S. Iohn* speaketh of, saying *they went out from vs*, an euident marke, or band of heretikes. So that you see two great differences, for which you cannot retort vpon *Philodox*, that which he vrgeth against you, and therfore if you haue nothing else to answer, you must be constrayned to beare that, which he chargeth you with.

1.Ioh.2.19.

Orthodox. *But if our forefathers deriued their orders from such Bishops, as were Papish Priests, what inconuenience will follow?*

Didimus. Why doe you speake with iffs, *Orthodox*, seeing it is the whole ground of all your proofes? But let *Philodox* speake.

Philodox. *Then either confesse your calling to be vnlawfull, or acknowledge ours to be lawfull, from whence you deriue it. You cannot gather figges of thornes, nor grapes of thistles: neither is it possible for a Rose, to spring out of a nettle.*

Orthodox. 2. *But a garden of roses may be ouergrowne with nettles. For the ministerie planted by Christ was a sweet rose without any nettle, and so it continued in the Church for certaine ages: but when Antichrist began to reuele himselfe in the temple of God, as though he were God, the Romish Priest-hood became a monstrous birth, strangely compounded, halfe rose, and halfe nettle: the church of England, in the beginning of reformation, did borrow from the church of Rome the rose, but left the nettle.*

Didimus. Fie, fie, *Orthodox*, I am ashamed on your behalfe, did euer man heare so sensles a discourse, in so serious a subiect? Doe you not marke, that this very point is of such moment, that vnlesse it be throughly cleared by authority, either of holy scripture, or receiued antiquity, all that, which you haue said in your whole 5. bookes, is but meere wind, a blast of words without al true force? If you see this, why do you reason so idly? or if you do not see it, permit me to shew it you, that thereby you may also see, how far you are from concluding your purpose. Is not your intent, to maintain the calling of your Bishops in *England* to be canonicall: and your mean or medium to do this, is it not to maintain their succession from the Catholike Bishops? whence riseth the obiection proposed by *Philodox*, to wit, how your Bishops calling can be good, being deriued by succession frō that, which you esteem sacrilegious, and abominable? which vnles you solue solidly, you wilbe so far frō prouing your calling good & canonical, that you will leaue it proued, euē by your own principles, sacrilegius, and

abomina-

abominable. For answer to this main obiectiõ, you tel a tale, not of a tub indeed, but (lesse to the purpose) of a monstrus birth, of a thing half nettle, & half rose. Surely you were not in your wits I think, whē you bestowed so much labour, to bring the matter to such a point as that either you must cõfesse your superintēdents to be sacrilegious Priests, (as you tearme them) or els meere laie men. For I dare vndertake to shew this dream, of the nettle and the rose, to be as idle a fancie, as euer entred into anie mans imaginatiõ; which being performed, one of the aforemētioned mēbers, to wit, that your superintēdēts are either sacrilegius priests (I speake in your opiniõ) or meere laie men, must necessarilie follow, vnles you can bring some better reason for the cõtrary thē hitherto is shewed. But to perform that which I haue promised.

3. First, it is euident by the consent of all men, that an argument, or proofe drawn from a simile, or comparison (as this of the composition of the Roman Priest-hood is) is the most weake, and feeble kind of argument of all other. Secondlie, a simile drawne from, a naturall thing may somtimes, when it is fitlie applied, helpe vs to conceiue a supernatural, which for the height, and eminencie it hath aboue our capacitie, cānot otherwise be conceiued of vs, but in that case, a simile prooueth nothing at all. Thirdlie, all similes (that they may be of any vse in our discourses) must be taken from things either trulie being, or at least in possibilitie by nature to be. For he that would proove one thing, by a simile taken from another, which is vnpossible, shall not onlie not proue that he would, but shall euidentlie disproue the same. For example, if one would proue you *Orthodox* to be so composed, as that you should be halfe a man, and halfe an asse. (patience *Orthodox*, you shall see I intend you no wrong) by this same example of a birth halfe nettle, and halfe rose which you vse, and should saie, that though you were borne a perfect man, and so continued for some yeares, yet since you went to the Vniuersitie, you are become a monstrous birth strangelie compounded, halfe man and halfe asse, would you not say (and truely in mine opinion) that he was not halfe, but a perfect asse, that should make such an argument? and that he is so farre from prouing that he purposed, that he concludeth manifestlie the contrary? All these defects being in your discourse *Orthodox*, I leaue to your

selfe to iudge, how sound your answer is to *Philodox* his obiection. Forthly, seeing the force of your answer dependeth, vpon the truth of that strange composition of the Roman Priest-hood, which you mention, you should haue not supposed it (though it had bin more probable, or possible then it is) but you should haue proued it, if not by holy Scripture (which kind of proofe you rigorously exact of your aduersaries) yet by receiued antiquity, or some sound natural reason, or at least by some true example in nature, and not by a meere Chymericall, and impossible composition, which nature neuer intended, or thought of. But will you, that I tell you the truth? this comparison suteth well with the calling of your ministery, which is as truly lawful as your monstrous birth halfe rose, and halfe nettle is in nature possible.

Pag. 164. 4. Fiftly, though, as I imagine, you are not so *Orthodox* as to hold, that holy orders is a sacrament, yet you acknowledge a certaine forme of words, necessary for conferring of orders, which being supposed, I aske of you, whether these words may not so be altered, by adding of others vnto them, that they remaine no more the true forme of holy orders? If you say no: you must also say (contrary to all authority,) that this forme of baptisme is good, I baptise thee in the name of the Father greater, and of the Sonne lesser, and of the holy Ghost, the least. If you say, yea, then would I know of you, why the additions, which you say the Papists haue added to the true forme of order (being greater then that, which is mentioned in the forme of baptisme) doe not make the order none? Againe, you know, as I suppose, that euery addition made to the essence, or nature of any thing doth change it into another essence, or nature, as euerie addition put to a number, maketh it a distinct number frō that it was before, for the nature or essence of euerie thing, in good Philosophie is like a number, which consisting indiuisible, is altered by euerie addition put thereunto. The Papists therfore adding (as you say) to the nature, and essence of the forme of holie orders, that which appertayneth not thereunto, but maketh it idolatrous, they must needes corrupt the whole, and make all nettle, and consequently leaue no rose, for your Superintendents to plucke after them: who therefore must of necessity seeke their calling, else-where, then from the

pope.

pists, who are prooued out of your doctrine (marke that I say out of your doctrine *Orthodox*) to haue none at all. And thus you see, that *Philodox* his obiection standeth, in full force against you: and that you must either acknowledge the Romane priesthood to be good and lawfull, or confesse that yours is either none at all, or at least vnlawfull; seing you haue none other but that, which you take from them. Againe, seing you confesse, that the ministerie planted by Christ was a sweete rose, and continued so for certaine ages: why do you not note the time, and place, and persons, when, where, and by whom this monstrous birth was brought forth? If you can bring but reasonable proofe, of any one of these three circumstances of this monstrous chaunge you speake of, I will take it for a satisfying answere, to all that which hath hitherto bene obiected against you, so that you shall not neede to labour in any thing els. If you cannot do this (as I know yon cannot) cease for shame to obiect, against your mother the Catholique church, such prophane, and adulterous behauiour. But let vs now heare *Philodox*.

VVhat will you make of vs? are we ministers, or lay men? if we be ministers, then so acknowledge vs. If we be lay men, then I pray you, what was Cranmer, who had no consecration, but in our church? what were all the Bishops in king Edwards time, which were consecrated by Cranmer? what was Mathew Parker, Grindall, Sands, Horne, which were all ordained Priests in our church? were they all lay men? what are all the ministers in England at this day, which derive their orders from the former? are they all lay men? Philodox.

5. *Your popish Priests are neither the true ministers of the Gospel, nor meerely lay men. For your ordination consisteth of two parts: the former in these words, take thou power to offer sacrifice, and to celebrate masse for the quicke, and the dead, which you account the principall function of Christian priesthood, but in truth it maketh you not the ministers of Christ, but of Antichrist: the latter in these words, receiue the holy Ghost, Whose sins thou forgiuest, they are forgiuen, and whose sins thou retainest, they are retained, in which Euangelicall words, there is deliuered a ghostlie ministeriall power to forgiue sinnes, which, according to the true meaning of Christ, is performed by the ministerie of reconciliation. Therfore whosoeuer hath receiued this power, hath withall receiued the ministerie of reconciliation, consisting, as was before declared, in the due administration of the word, and sacraments.* Orthodox.

Didimus. You do greatlie abuſe your tearmes *Orthodox*, in ſaying that the ordination of the Popish Prieſts conſiſteth of two parts (if by ordination you vnderſtand the order receiued, as you do in the paragraffe following.) For as the ſoule of man is but one indiuiſible ſubſtance, hauing diuers diſtinct powers; ſo likewiſe the order of prieſthood is but one indiuiſible power, reſiding in the ſoule of the ordained, and hauing alſo diuers diſtinct faculties. And therfore your conceite of two parts of their preiſthood, is but a groſſe errour of your owne, which you ſeeme to correct in the words following, calling that a function (like a ſcholler) which before you called a part, like a man ignorant in his tearmes. Now ſeing the whole force of your ſolution to the obiection made, dependeth vpon this errour of two partes in the Popish prieſthood, you cannot be ſo blind but ſee, that it is nothing to the purpoſe. For if it be but one ſimple power with diuers faculties, but without parts, you muſt either take it all, and be ſacrilegious with the Papiſts, or leaue it all, and be but meere laie men. And albeit the diuers faculties, or functions of Preiſthood be giuen at diuers times, and by diuers words, as you ſay, yet is not preiſthood therby prooued to haue diuers parts, more then the ſoule of man is prooued, to be alſo compounded of diuers parts, by that it firſt giueth life and growth, then ſence, and laſt of all vnderſtanding, and reaſon.

Of the cheefe function of prieſthood, which is to offer ſacrifice for the quicke and the dead, we ſhall haue fitter opportunitie to ſpeake heerafter. In the meane while, I cannot omit to tell you *Orthodox*, that I much marueile at your rachnes in affirming, without all teſtimonie either of ſcripture, or antiquitie, that the power of ſacrificing is the miniſterie of Antichriſt, eſpeciallie ſeing you are accuſtomed to demaund of your aduerſaries ſo rigorouſlie expreſſe ſcripture, for the proofe of their religion, and hold it as an article of your beleefe, that nothing is to be beleeued, which is not prooued by ſcripture. Surelie *Orthodox*, there is no equall dealing in this courſe of yours, and therfore for your credit ſake do I require ſome teſtimonie of ſcripture, or at leaſt of antiquitie, prooving this poſition of yours: to wit, that the power of ſacrificing maketh the Prieſts of the Rowane church, to be the miniſters of Anti-

chriſt.

chriſt. For if this power be not diſproued, your miniſterie, which wanteth it, is clearelie diſproued: and ſeing the diſproofe of it belongeth vnto you, as neceſſarie for the iuſtifying of your miniſterie, you foullie forget your ſelfe, in leauing it without all other proofe, but your owne bare aſſertion.

For your doctrine of the latter part of their prieſthood (I ſpeake in your owne tearmes *Orthodox*, for your better vnderſtanding) thoſe, that you call Papiſts in England, are greatlie beholding to you: for you deliuer them from the fowle imputation of treaſon, wherof diuers haue bene accuſed, condemned, and executed for reconciling men to god, by the power of reconciliation, giuen them by Chriſt himſelfe, as you confeſſe. Surelie if in the Popish prieſthood (as you tearme it) be included the lawfull power of reconciliation, as you ſay, and your aduerſaries do not deny, the ſtatute made againſt the practiſe of that power, in the 23. yeare of *Q. Elizabeth*, and confirmed by King Iames muſt needs be vniuſt, as directlie againſt the power giuen by Chriſt to his lawfull miniſters. And if for feare of incurring the ſeuere penaltie of the ſame ſtatute, you will ſay, that they abuſe the lawfull power of reconciliation, and therfore are, or may be traitors. I anſwere in their behalfe, that if by abuſe you vnderſtand, that they vſe it not, but by the meanes of ſacramentall confeſſion, I acknowledge that they vſe it not otherwaies, but I deny this to be any abuſe. Againe though it were an abuſe, yet can it haue no appearance of treaſon, But I ſee you readie to replie, that they reconcile men to the church, and to the obedience of the ſee of Rome, which is treaſon; wherunto I am as readie to anſwere, that their intent, and practice is only, to reconcile ſinners to God, through remiſſion of their ſins by that power, which you confeſſe them to haue, and if it follow hereupon, that they are reconciled to the Catholique Romane church, as to the ſpouſe of Chriſt, who ordained this power of reconciliation, and therby are made sheepe of that fold, wherof the Pope (being Chriſts vicar vpon earth) is cheefe Paſtor, this cannot iuſtlie be imputed vnto them for treaſon, no more then it can be to you, to haue baptiſed one, wherupon followeth neceſſarilie the ſelfe ſame reconciliation to the Catholique church, and to the viſible Paſtor therof.

Philodox. If it be ſo, then you muſt confeſſe, that the prieſthood of the church of Rome hath the miniſteriall ſunction, becauſe theſe words are vſed in their ordination.

Orthodox. Though theſe words as they were ſpoken by Chriſt, practiſed in the primitiue church, and are vſed at this day in the church of England, imply the ſubſtance of this holy function, yet as you abuſe them in the church of Rome, to maintaine Popiſh ſhrift, the gold is couered with droſſe, and the ſweete flower is ouershadowed with noyſome weeds. VVherfore if we conſider your prieſthood, as it is a totum aggregatū conſiſting of ſacrificing, and abſoluing, it is vnlawfull, and contrarie to the ſcripture: if we come to the parts therof, your maſſing, and ſacrificing is ſimply abhominable; the other part, ſo farre as it reſteth vpon the woords of Chriſt, taken in their true ſenſe and meaning, is holy, and implieth a miniſteriall power, which notwithſtanding by your conſtruction and practiſe is greatly depraued.

Why is not this ſcripture citedbecauſe it is not to be found.

Didimus. I am wearie Orthodox of thoſe emptie, and idle diſcourſes, where ſo many things are ſaid, and not one prooued. In ſteed of ſound arguments to prooue the Romane prieſthood to be ſacrilegious, and your miniſtrie (though deriued from it) to be good, you bring nothing but imaginarie ſimiles of births half nettle, and half roſe, and impertinent Metaphors of Gold and flowers, droſſe and weedes, fictions of a *totum aggregatum*, where there is but one ſimple power hauing diuers functions, as is aforeſaid, I neuer heard ſuch a droſſie diſcourſe. If this be ſufficient to ouerthrow the Romane prieſthood, and eſtabliſh your miniſtrie, what will you ſay to the Puritanes and Anabaptiſts, who will affoord you the like, yea and better arguments againſt you?

Marke, I pray you, this ſaying of that great piller of Gods church *S. Athanaſius* writing againſt the *Arrians*, who bragged as much of the errour of their Catholique predeceſſors, as you do of that of the Papiſts, of whom he ſaith thus: *VVhat will they teach the people whom they inſtruct? will they ſay, that their predeceſſors erred? and how ſhall they be eſteemed of their diſciples true ſaiers, whom they perſuade that they are not to giue credit to their maiſters?* Is not this the true reaſon, for which ſince *Luthers* reuoult from the Catholique Church, you are deuided into ſo manie ſects and reformations, that it is not eaſie to reckon them? you ſay, the Papiſts erred, and their prieſthood is ſacrilegious: do not the Puritans

Epiſt. de concilijs Arimin. & Seleuc. ſect. quis igitur.

See a notable ſaying of Tertullian to the ſame purpoſe. cap. 4. n. 4.

Puritans ſay the ſame of you, and the Anabaptiſts of them? And rightly. For whileſt you ſay, that your fathers erred, you teach your ſucceſſours and ſcholers to ſay the ſame of you, and theirs of them, till you end in plaine Atheiſme. In one word if you will ſay any thing to the purpoſe, in the matter you haue in hand, you muſt firſt prooue by holie Scripture, the Roman Prieſt hood to be ſacrilegious, or at leaſt you muſt ſhew when, and by whom it began to be corrupted, ſeeing you confeſſe it was once pure and good, and then are you to prooue, that it is alſo diuiſible in ſuch ſort, as that one part or peece remaineth good, though the other be corrupted, and laſtly that you haue the ſecond part. Theſe three things when you haue well prooued (as I know you can neuer prooue one of them) then may you bragge, that your calling and miniſtery is lawfull, though it be taken from that of the Roman church, which you eſteeme vnlawfull, till then your Superintendents muſt be content, either to be Popish Prieſts, from whom you pretend they be diſcended, (but this they neither are, nor would be) or elſe to be ſacrilegious vſurpers of an holy vocation, which though they would not be, yet are they: for true Bishops, which they would be, they are not, as henceforth ſhall be prooued.

6. Hitherto hath it beene prooued againſt Maſter *Maſon*, that though the pretended Bishop of England did truly, and verilie receiue their calling, from the Catholique Bishops, yet can this be none at all according to their owne doctrine, in which the Bishops of the Roman church are heretiques and conſequently vnable to giue any lawfull calling, as is before ſhewed.

Secondly, that though the former impediment were not, yet, ſeeing they diſclaime from the whole, and perfect order of the Catholique Roman Bishops, as being ſacrilegious and abominable, they are for another reaſon concluded to haue none at all. For the order of the Roman Prieſt-hood is not diuiſible in diuers parts, but is one and an indiuiſible power, hauing diuers functions not vnlike our ſoules, as is before ſhewed, and therefore is either all whollie giuen, or nothing at all. All which hath beene ſaid not to diſprooue, or diſallow the Prieſt-hood, and calling of the Roman church, which is moſt holie and canonicall, but onlie to ſhew the miſerable blindneſſe, and per-

uerſity of the Proteſtants, that being forced to challenge their calling from thoſe, who, if they were ſuch, as by them they are eſteemed, can giue them none, are therefore conſtrayned either to condemne themſelues, of ſacrilegious vſurpation, and intruſion, as hauing no calling, or to iuſtifie them whom they blindlie abhorre, as wicked, and abominable.

Henceforth we will examine the calling that our English intendents pretend to haue, according to the three heads before mentioned. To wit, whether their calling, which they pretend to receiue from *Cranmer*, be good and canonicall, as well in reſpect of the callers as of the called, and calling it ſelfe, ſuppoſing (as confeſſed of either part) the calling of the Catholique Roman Biſhops to be good, and canonicall, or at leaſt ſo ſufficient, as lawfull calling may be deriued from it.

And becauſe there are foure diuers ſorts or degrees of perſons, all pretending to be true biſhops, of whoſe true calling, there is queſtion for diuers difficulties therein appearing, they ſhall be examined all apart, as they alſo are by M. *Maſons*, beginning firſt with *Cranmer*, proceeding afterward to *Barlow*, *Scorie*, *Couerdal* and others made in King Edwards daies then deſcending to *Mathew Parker* with his fellowes, made in the beginning of Queene *Elizabeths* raigne, and laſt of all to thoſe that haue euer ſince ſucceeded vntill this day. For though there be canonicall impediments in all and euery one of theſe, yet are they not the ſame in euery one, and therefore can they not be handled together, but muſt be ſpoken of a part. I mention not here thoſe, that were either made, or continued in Queene *Maries* time, becauſe there is no controuerſie, but they were ordered after the Catholique manner of the Roman church. And though ſome of them were in the ſchiſme of King Henry the eight, yet being the whole Realme reconciled, to the vnity of the Catholique church, the ſecond yeare of Queene *Marie*, they could haue no canonicall impediment in their calling. Beſides they were confirmed by Cardinall *Poole* Legate, as M. *Maſon* alleageth out of *Saunders*.

Stow in Q. Marie.

Lib. 2. cap. 9. pag. 79.

l. 2. 260.

The eleuenth Chapter.

Cranmer *continued not lawfull Bishop till his death.*

1. I Suppose that *Cranmer* was canonically ordayned Bishop, as well in respect of his ordayners, of his ordination, and also of himselfe ordayned, and therefore propose the question only of his continuation, in his lawfull ordination and calling. Neither is the question, whether the power of order continued with him till his death. For no Catholique author euer either denied, or doubted, but that holie order once receiued (notwithstanding what censure soeuer incurred, yea degradation it selfe, or crime committed) doth euer remaine, because it is immortall, or incorruptible, as baptisme is. And therfore M. *Mason* fighteth against his owne shadow, when he laboureth to prooue this (which no man denieth) as he doth at large in his 2. booke and 91. chapter. But the question is, whether during his life he lost the lawfull authoritie to vse, and exercise the power of his order, or no; which is a question farre different from thother, as hath bene alreadie prooued, and may briefly be declared by this example. He that hath the kings patent of cheefe iusticeship, is trulie cheefe iustice, yet if the king suspend him from the execution of his office, either in whole or in part, he hath not the lawfull vse therof: and if during that suspension he attempt any thing in the execution of his office, his fact shalbe vnlawful, not for default of power, which he is supposed to haue by the kings patent, but for default of authoritie, to vse the power he hath. In like manner he that hath the order, or character of a Bishop, is trulie Bishop, but if the vse and exercise of his order, be suspended (as it may manie waies be without preiudice of his order) whatsoeuer he shall attempt in the exercise of it, during the suspension, shalbe vnlawfull. This example is prought onlie to shew, that the power of order remaining, the lawfull vse therof may be lost, or taken

The sense of the question.

Cap. 9. n. 11. and forward.

The distinction of the power of order, and the lawfull vse therof M. Mason alloweth, as is manifest by his words cited in the proofe of the conclusion following.

taken away, which it doth ſufficientlie ſhew, though there be in other reſpects diſparitie in the two caſes, a thing ordinarie in all examples, which doe not run vpon fowre feete, as the ſaying is. The queſtion therefore being this, the reſolution is.

Concluſion. That *Cranmer* before his death loſt the lawfull vſe, and exerciſe of his Biſhops power, or order; and therefore loſt alſo the power to giue true and lawfull calling to thoſe, whom he ordayned. The ſecond part of this concluſion will neceſſarilie follow vpon the proofe of the firſt. For the power to giue true calling includeth neceſſarilie the lawfull vſe of order, aſwell in him that calleth, as in him that is called, no man being called but to vſe the power, which he receiueth by his calling, and he onlie is ſaid to vſe a thing, that lawfullie vſeth it. The firſt part therefore I prooue thus. By ſchiſme and hereſie is loſt the lawfull vſe of the power of Epiſcopall order: But *Cranmer* before he died, fell into ſchiſme and hereſie: Therefore before he died, he loſt the lawful vſe of the power of Epiſcopall order. This argument concludeth directlie, and infalliblie, if the premiſſes be made good. The firſt whereof *M. Mason* denieth not, yea directlie granteth, ſaying that *ſuch as obſerue the ſubſtance of inſtitution being themſelues in ſchiſme or hereſie, doe miniſter* legitimum, *but not legitime, and thoſe that receiue it from them haue a lawfull baptiſme, but not lawfully*; though he ſpecifie here baptiſme onlie yet is his doctrine, and the Catholique alſo the ſame of holie orders. And he teacheth the ſame more plainlie in theſe words: *If by indelible character be meant only a gratious gift neuer to be reiterated, then we may ſafely confeſſe, that in baptiſme, and holy orders, there is imprinted an indelible character. For a man rightly baptiſed, becomming a Turke or Iewe, and returning to the faith, is in no caſe to be rebaptiſed: likewiſe when a Prieſt lawfully ordayned, becomming a ſchiſmatique, or heretique, is iuſtly cenſured for his crimes, and after is reclaymed, he may in no caſe be reordayned, but may performe his function, by vertue of his orders formerly receiued.* Hereby it followeth manifeſtlie, that in *M. Masons* doctrine, ſchiſme and hereſie taketh away, the lawfull vſe of holie order. For ſeeing it taketh not awaie the order it ſelfe, as *M. Mason* for his owne aduantage ſaith (though not concordablie with the reſt of his doctrine of holie order) and yet maketh the ordination giuen by it, to be vnlawfullie giuen, as he confeſſeth in his formall words, it muſt neceſſarilie take awaie the lawfull vſe there-

Pag. 61.

Pag. 81.

But leaſt *M. Maſon* ſeing himſelfe Preſt with his owne doctrine, ſhould recall it, or at leaſt others his brethren ſhould denie it, I will prooue it by more weightie authoritie, then M. *Maſons*. For which purpoſe I will firſt prooue, that ſchiſme, and hereſie take not away, the power of order receiued, which though I might ſuppoſe as not onlie graunted, but alſo prooued by M. *Maſon*, yet becauſe my purpoſe is, not onlie to refute M. *Maſon*, but to prooue againſt all our English Proteſtants, that their Bishops haue no true calling at all, I will leaue nothing vnprooued, that may be doubted of by any one. But to the purpoſe. Pag. 83.

3. *S. Leo* the great receiueth *Donatus Salicinenſis*, and his people, or flocke conuerted from the hereſie of *Nouatus* to the Catholique church, and leaueth him in his charge. *Epiſt. 22. ad Epiſcopos Afric. n. 3.*

And of one *Maximus* he ſaith thus. *If Maximus be no more a Donatiſt, but free from ſchiſme, though ordered not without fault, we do not depoſe him from his epiſcopall dignitie.*

Secondlie, the ſeaueneth generall councell, which was holden at *Nice*, and is called the 2. *Nicene* councell, defineth according to the doctrine of the former generall councels, and fathers, that not onlie ſuch Bishops, and others of the cleargie, as hauing bene heretiques, and afterwards are conuerted to the Catholique faith, but alſo ſuch as were ordained by heretiques, being likewiſe conuerted, are to be receiued not onlie to the vnitie of the church, but alſo to the vſe of their order, and that councell receiued ten Bishops, wherof ſome confeſſed themſelues to haue bene borne in hereſie, and ſo euer continued vntill that time, when they did abiure their error. *Synod. 7. actio. 5. per tot.*

Thirdlie *S. Auguſtine* ſaith, that *holy order doth ſo remaine, that albeit anyone be for his fault removed from his office, yet the ſacrament once giuen is neuer loſt, though it remaine to the condemnation of him, that hath it.* And againe. *Both are ſacraments, and giuen by a certaine conſecration, that, when one is Baptiſed, this, when one is ordered, and therfore in the Catholique church, it is not lawfull, that either of them be reiterated.* And this ſhall ſuffice for the proofe of this point, which is moſt cleare both in the grounds of Chriſtian doctrine, and alſo in the practice of the whole church, which (as *S. Auguſtin* ſaith in the words euen now cited) neuer allowed reordi- *De bono coniugali cap. 24.* *Lib. 2. cont. epiſt. Parmenian cap. 13.*

nation, yea did absolutelie forbid it in the councell of Carth in S. *Ambrose* his time, which is to be vnderstood of ordination truly giuen. For the councell of *Nice* did decree, that the Paulianists should be ordered againe by Catholique Bishops, but that was because they had no true orders before, no nor yet true baptisme. If therfore reordination haue euer bene practised by any, it was vpon coniecture, or presumption of some essentiall defect in the former ordination, but how probablie this was done, it neither belongeth to this place to examine, neither doth it any way perraine to the question in hand. And therfore M. *Mason*, if it had not bene either to make his booke swell, or that the good man was loth to loose such an occasion, to taxe some Pope of errour, though but in a matter of fact, wherin no man doth thinke them infallible, well might haue omitted that, which he inserteth of this matter impertinentlie, shewing therein more of the spirit of graceles Cham, that published his Fathers nakednes, then of his other brethren, that couered the same.

This canon is cited in the 3. councell of carthag cap. 37. Bin. to. 1. pag. 545. Concils: Nice can. 19. Bin. to. 1. pag. 3. 10.

Pag. 85. & sequentib.

Now albeit it be cleare, that heresie doth not take away the power of order, or character once receiued, yet is it no lesse manifest, that it maketh the ordinations by heretiques to be vnlawfull, and not canonicall. And because this cannot be, but by depriuing them of the lawfull vse and exercise of the power of order, which they haue, therfore it is plaine, that heretiques haue not the lawfull vse of their orders receiued: which is that I am here to proue.

4. That ordinations made by hereriques haue euer bene esteemed vnlawfull, there is nothing more manifest in all antiquitie, as appeareth.

Synod. 7. act. 1.

First by the long dispute had in the second councell of *Nice*, about the receiuing of those that were ordained by heretiques.

Secondlie, the first *Nicen* councell decreed, that such as had bene ordained by *Meletius* an heretique should, vpon their conuersion be receiued with their orders, *being confirmed with more holy praiers*, or suffrages as Theodoret testifieth. Meletius himselfe being depriued of all power to ordaine any more.

Sacratioribus suffragijs confirmatos. l. 1. c. 9.

Thirdlie, the councell of Sardis declared, that not only Gregorius of Alexandria, Basilius of Ancyra, and Quintianus of Gaza heretiques, and intruded into other mens see as, but also

Theod. l. 2. c. 8 post medium

Theodorus

Theodorus of Heraclea, Narciſſus of Neroniadis, with diuers others, conuicted of Arrius, his hereſie, to be no Bishops, not becauſe they had not the power of epiſcopall order, but becauſe they had loſt the lawfull vſe therof by hereſie.

See a notable teſtimonie of the counſell of Sardy to the ſame purpoſe hereafter cap. 15. n 3. Apol. 2. epiſt. Iulij ab initio ſatis. Epiſt ad Nycopolitas cited in the 7. generall counſell act. 1. ad finem. Pag. 78. Pag. 87.

Fourthlie *S. Athanaſius* in the perſon of Iulius Pope of Rome ſaith, that it *is vnpoſſible, the ordination of Prieſts made by Secundus an Arrian Bishop ſhould haue any place in the Catholique church.*

And *S. Baſil. I know him not for Bishop, nor number them amongſt the Prieſts of Chriſt, which haue bene promoted to any dignitie, by defiled hands, to the deſtruction of faith.*

The ſame teach Innocentius the firſt, and Nicholaus the firſt, with diuers others cited by *M. Maſon*, who either not vnderſtanding, or diſſembling their meaning, maketh doubt, how they may be reconciled with the Catholique doctrine, forbidding reordination. I marueile that ſo ſmall a thing doth truble him, eſpeciallie conſidering his owne doctrine, wherin he euidentlie diſtenguisheth, as is alreadie noted, betweene the power of order, and the lawfull vſe therof, wherby are eaſily reconciled all the differences, which ſeeme to appeare in the words of the auncient Fathers or councels in this point, they ſometimes acknowledging, and receiuing the ordinations by heretiques for ſufficient, ſometimes reiecting them as if they were none at all. For receiuing them, they acknowledge the power of order, or character giuen by heretiques (ſuppoſing they vſe true forme, and ſubſtance of ordination) and adde thervnto the lawfull vſe, which the ordained had not by their ordination, but recouer it by their reconciliation to the church. When they reiect them, they deny not the power of order, but the lawfull vſe therof, which the ordained cannot haue, ſo long as they remaine in hereſie, and ſeparation from the church. For the lawfull vſe of the power of order neceſſarilie ſuppoſeth the vnion, or communion with the Catholique church. And this is it that Innocentius and others fathers ſay, that heretiques cannot giue to thoſe they ordaine, becauſe they haue it not themſelues: and not hauing, this, and wanting therby the lawfull vſe of their orders, they are ſaid to haue nothing, becauſe he that hath any thing ordained to a certaine vſe, and yet cannot make that vſe therof, is in the ſame caſe, as if he had it not at all. So that the great difficultie *M. Maſon*

True calling doth not only include the power of order, but alſo the lawfull vſe of the ſame.

did apprehend in reconciling *Innocentius*, and *Nicholaus* with the rest of the fathers and councels, reiecting reordination, is eaſlie ouercome.

5. And that the communion with the true church (whereſoeuer it be) is neceſſarilie required to the lawfull vſe of the power of holie order, and conſequentlie to the deliuerie of lawfull calling, our aduerſaries cannot deny. For I would know of them, whether they thinke, that the *Arrians* had either true calling themſelues being in hereſie, or true power to call others? and whether by their ordinations, they did giue true calling to the ordained? If they ſay yea, then muſt they neceſſarilie condemne the whole Catholique church of errour, and iniuſtice, for condemning them in the councell of Sardis, euen now cited and declaring them to be no Bishops. If they ſay no (as I thinke they will) then muſt they neceſſarilie confeſſe, that beſides the power of order which they had, was neceſſarie alſo the vnion with the Catholique church, that they might either haue true calling themſelues, or deliuer it to others, no other reaſon why they ſhould not haue true calling, being to be aſſigned. If therfore it be prooued, that *Cranmer* was an heretique, and therbie ſeparated from the vnion of the Catholique church, it will alſo follow, that notwithſtanding he was canonicallie ordained (as all or moſt of the firſt *Arrian* Bishops were) that he loſt the lawfull vſe of his orders, and therfore neither continued in true calling himſelfe, nor could trulie call others.

And to make it yet more plaine, that the actuall vnion, or communion with the bodie of Chriſt (which is his church) is neceſſarie, that any one may haue, or giue true calling (and conſequentlie that no heretiques can either haue it, or giue it, they being by the Apoſtles owne mouth ſeparated from the communitie of the faithfull) it is to be conſidered, that no man is either called himſelfe, or calleth others to any Eccleſiaſticall function or office, to exerciſe the ſame in his owne name, by his owne power, or to his owne behalfe, or benefit alone: but in the power and honour firſt of Chriſt, and then in the name, and for the benefit of his church, whoſe miniſter he is; if therfore he be wilfullie ſeperated from Chriſt, and his church (as all heretiques are) he cannot do any thing in their

Tit. 3. 10.

power, or in their honour or edification, for neither hath he their concurrence or commiſſion, being ſeparated from them, nor hath he the will and intention thervnto, but to the contrarie: Whatſoeuer therfore he doth or attempteth to do in that kind, he doth it in his owne name and power, and to the benefit of that bodie, wherof he is either head, or member, to wit, of that ſect of hereſie, wherof he maketh profeſſion, and conſequentlie vnlawfullie. And in ſteed of making him, whom he ordaineth, a miniſter of Chriſt, and of his church, he maketh him partaker of his owne hereſie, and rebellion, and a miniſter therof.

6. And in this reſpect there is a great difference, betweene the ſacrament of baptiſme, and holie order, though in ſome other things they be like. For though the power of order, or character be trulie giuen by heretiques (ſuppoſing alwaies the true matter and forme be vſed by a true Bishop) as is that of baptiſme; yet becauſe the power of order is an actiue power, ordained to miniſter other ſacraments, and exerciſe other functions in the church, wheras the character of baptiſme is onlie a paſſiue power, in reſpect of other ſacraments, which it maketh vs capable to receiue, but not to miniſter: therfore doth the ſacrament of orders to the lawfull miniſtring therof, require beſides the power of order, the lawfull vſe of the ſame, which thoſe, who are excommunicate, and ſeparated from the vnitie of Gods church (as all hereriques are) cannot haue. And thus farre haue we prooued, that heretique Bishops, though canonicallie ordered, haue no lawfull power to vſe their epiſcopall order, and conſequentlie cannot giue anie lawfull calling to others, which was the firſt of the premiſes of that argument, wherwith our concluſion was prooued. Now it remaineth to prooue the ſecond, which is, that *Cranmer* before he died, fell into hereſie.

Though I neede not ſtand much vpon the proofe of this, but might make good the concluſion before ſet downe by this argument. Either *Cranmer*, after his reuolt from the Catholicke church or thoſe that ordered him, were heretiques: but whether he or they were ſo, he could not haue the lawfull vſe, and exerciſe of his Bishops power, or order; therfore *Cranmer*, whether he was heretique or no, could not haue the lawfull

vse of his Bishops order. This argument, supposing the doctrine of all antiquitie to be true (that heretiques are not lawfull Bishops) is vnanswerable. And though, I say, I might make vse therof, to prooue mine intent without any Farther labour, yet will I for thy greater contentment (good reader) prooue *M. Cranmer* an heretique, and purge his orderers from that note, which I will do.

7. First, by his owne confession, which M. Fox Setteth downe at large thus. *I Thomas Cranmer late Archbishop of Canterbury, do renounce, abhorre and detest, all manner of heresies, and errours of Luther and Zninglius, and all other teachings, which be contrarie to sound and true doctrines. And I beleeue most constantlie in mine heart, and with my mouth I confesse one only and Catholique church visible, without the which there is no saluation, and therof I acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be supreame head in earth, whom I acknowledge to be the highest Bishop, and Pope, and Christs vicar, vnto whom all Christian people ought to be subiect.* And after the confession of many other articles of the Catholique faith he concludeth thus. *And God is my witnes, that I haue not done this for fauour, or feare of any person, but willingly and of mine owne mind, as well to the discharge of mine owne conscience, as to the instruction of other.* In rigour of law this one argument would suffice to prooue Cranmer to haue bene an heretique, not for this abiuration, which here he maketh, but for that he perfidiously returned to the errours here abiured, and therin died, as also he had liued in them before.

Acts pag. 1710. editionis 1610.

8. Secondly, the doctrine, which he professed after his separatiō from the Romane church, was authentically condēned by the same authority and iudgement, that Arranianisme, and all other heresies haue bene condemned since the Apostles time, to wit, by the iudgment of the same Catholique church, assembled in a lawfull generall councell at Trent. Where I would haue thee (iudicious reader) to obserue, that as on thone side nothing can be said in defence, or fauour of this heresie, condēned in the generall councell of Trent, which the Arrians might not haue said in defence of their heresie condemned in the holy generall councell of Nice, the Arrians alleaging scripture, and the errour of the Catholique church in defence of their heresie, as well as the Protestats do for theirs: so on the other side there can be no kind of argument produced for the proofe of the doctrine defi-

ned

ned, ſet downe or declared in the Nicene councell, and for the diſproofe of the hereſie therein condẽned, which may not in like manner be produced, for the proofe of the doctrine of the Tridentine councell, and in diſproofe of the hereſie, which is in it condemned. For as the Catholiques alleaged againſt the Arians, the authoritie of ſcriptures, fathers, conſent and iudgmẽt of the church both auncient and moderne, ſo do they alſo againſt the Proteſtants. Therfore as Arrianiſme is a condemned hereſie, and the profeſſors therof heretiques, ſo likewiſe is Proteſtantiſme a condemned hereſie and thoſe that profeſſe it be heretiques, wherof Cranmer was one.

Thirdly, Cranmer went out, and ſeparated himſelfe from the church, wherin he was baptiſed, and ordered, which therfore was before him, and which neither he, nor any one for him can ſhew to haue gone out, or ſeparated it ſelf from any other church more auncient therof, ſince the Apoſtles times. But whoſoeuer goeth out of that church, or congregation wherin he is baptiſed, vnles he can ſhew, that it went out of another more auncient, is an heretique, therfore was Cranmer an heretique.

Fourthly, Cranmer going out from the Romane church ioined himſelfe to that company, whoſe firſt founders or beginners went alſo out of the ſame church, and which cannot deriue their Chriſtianitie from the Apoſtles, but by the diſcent, and ſucceſſion of the Romane church, which notwithſtanding they left, and afterwards impugned. But he that cannot deriue the Criſtianitie of that companie, wherunto he hath ioyned himſelfe, from the Apoſtles, but by the diſcent, or ſucceſſion of that church, which he hath forſaken and impugneth, is an heretique. Therfore was Cranmer an heretique. This ſhall ſuffice for the proofe of the ſecond propoſition of the argument, wherby was prooued the concluſion before ſet downe. And that M. Maſon ſhall ſee, that I vſe no hard meaſure of partialitie towards Cranmer, I do offer and promiſe, that if he can retort or apply, but any one of theſe foure arguments to the orderers of Cranmer, I will eſteeme them to haue been heretiques. It remaineth therfore fully prooued, that Cranmer through hereſie loſt the lawfull vſe, and exerciſe of his epiſcopall power and order; and conſequẽtly, that he alſo loſt the power to giue true calling

to thoſe, whom he ordained in the ſtate of hereſie.

9. But here *M. Maſon* out of his loue towards the Catholique Romane church, charitablie warneth, that *we take heede, leaſt while we go about to put out their eies, we pull out our owne.* For (ſaith he) *if your allegations be ſound, what will become of Bonner, Heath, and Turlby, who were conſecrated at ſuch time, when in your iudgment, both the conſecrators and conſecrated were ſtained with ſchiſme, and hereſie? Did all theſe receiue nothing, becauſe their conſecrators had nothing to giue? If they were no Bishops, then what becomes of the Bishops in Q. Maries time, whom theſe did conſecrate?* L. 2. c. 9. n. 3.

This great difficultie, leaſt we ſhould not be able to ſolue; *M. Maſon* ſolueth for vs ſaying whithin a few lines after, that *Cardinall Poole the Popes legate abſolued them from ſchiſme and hereſie, and ſo they were cõfirmed for lawfull Bishops.* The ſame thing that the councell of *Nice* practiſed with the *Nouatians*, as alſo *S. Leo* with the ſame, and with the *Donatiſts*, the 7. generall councell with other heretiques (as hath bene ſhewed before) and which hath euer bene vſed in the church, as occaſiõ occurred. So that *M. Maſon* is not, as I ſuppoſe, ſo blind, but that he ſeeth well; that in all this, there is no daunger of putting out our eies: let him looke therfore, how he can keepe his owne, and his fellowes ſafe; which, vnles he can ſhew the like confirmation, and reconciliation of *Cranmer*, and the reſt diſcended from him, to the vnitie of the Catholique church, which he confeſſeth of *Bonner*, and the reſt obiected by him, they muſt neceſſarilie remaine in the ſame ſtate, that the *Arrians*, and Nouatians were in, whileſt they, continued in their hereſie, and therfore can be no lawfull Bishops. For they, by the graueſt iudgment of the whole world were declared to be no Bishops, as we haue ſeene before out of *Theodoretus*. And how impoſſible it is for *M. Maſon* to ſhew any ſuch reconciliation, it is eaſilie vnderſtood, ſeing there were no Bishops in the whole world, by whom, or to whom, *Cranmer* might be reconciled, but thoſe from whom he wilfullie ſeparated himſelfe. For if he thinke to anſwere, that *Cranmer* leauing the vnitie of the Romane church, was receiued into the true church reformed by *Luther*, and *Zuinglius* (who were both his maſters, though oppoſite thone to thother) he is alreadie preuented in that euaſion. For beſids that they were no Bishops, and therfore neither had the true calling of Paſtors, nor

Can. 8.

Lib. 2 ca. 8.

giue it to others: there is the same difficultie of their reconciliation, that there is of *Cranmers*, they hauing also gone out of the same Romane church not long before him, and therfore must either necessarilie shew some church, whervnto they were vnited, after their separation from the Romane, or els must confesse themselues the foūders, and beginners of a church neuer heard of before, or at least not extant, when they reuoulted, which is as much as anie man of iudgment will require, to prooue them renegates and heretiques.

To conclude therfore this point; it is apparent by that, which hath hitherto bene prooued, were there no other defect, in the calling of the superintendents of the now English church, then that which they draw from *Cranmer*. that they haue no true, and lawfull calling at all, no more thē the *Arrians*, *Nouatians*, and other condemned heretiques had: but we shall yet find other matter. And thus much of *Cranmers* calling, of whose lewde life and deserued death, thou maist good reader, (if thou be disposed) see much in a few lines in that learned, and vnanswerable booke, called *A prudentiall ballance* pag. 234.

The twelueth Chapter.

That the Bishops made in King Edwards daies were no true, or lawfull Bishops.

1. HAuing shewed in the precedent chapter, that Cranmer after his fall into heresie (for in King Edwards time he was first a Lutheran, and afterwards a Zuinglian) he was no more lawfull Bishop, by the iudgment of the most entire and florishing church of Christ, in the councells of Nice, and Sardis, it followeth by necessarie cōsequence, that those that were ordered by him, and communicated with him in the same heresie, and continued therin, were for the same reason no Bishops, though they had had no other defect, or impediment at all. Yet because the Bishops ordained in King Edwards time from whom those of Queen Elizabeth preted to deriue their Succession are deemed,

to haue a more essentiall defect, then that of heresie either themselues, or in their ordainers: for the more cleare proofe of the meere secularitie, and pure nullitie of the pretended clergy of England, as well as of other falsly reformed churches: I will here examine the ordination of them, who are confessed to haue bene made in the raigne of K. Edward, that so we may by degrees descend to thothers ordained since. These were, a M. Mason saith, Nicholas Ridley, Robert Ferrar, John Hoope, John Poynet, John Scory, and miles Couerdall, whose calling is not only defectiue, in respect of heresie both in their callers (which we haue seene in the former chapter) and in themselues (they being confessed to haue bene Lutherans or Zuinglians) but also in respect of their calling it selfe, which is much more essentiall then thother, this being by no meanes to be repaired without a new ordination, wheras the other requireth only a confirmation, or reconciliation, as we haue said before. So that touching these men, the question is not whether their callers were lawfull Bishops or no, but whether the manner of their calling it selfe was substantiall, and sufficient or no.

Lib. 2. cap. 11.

2. M. Mason, who hath trauailed more painfullie, in the maintainaunce of the calling of the present English clergie, then any other that I know, confesseth, yea euidentlie prooueth, that the manner of consecrating Bishops in K. Edwards time was altered from that, which had bene in King Henries time, and euer before, bringing for this purpose a statute made in the third yeare of his raigne: which because he faileth truly to relate, (whether of purpose, or of negligence I know not) I will set it downe, as it is recorded by M. Poulton in these words.

Lib. 2. cap. 11. & 2. pag. 94.

Kalend an. 3. Ed. 6. cap. 12. Mason: pag. 94.

Such forme of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and other ministers of the church, shalbe vsed and none other, as by Sixe Prelates, and Sixe other men, learned in Gods lawe (to be appointed by the king) or the most number of them, shalbe deuised, and set foorth vnder the great seale, before the first day of Aprill next. According to this act *was there a forme, or manner of making Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, set forth the fift and Sixt yeare of king Edward, which,* (as M. Mason saith) *was recalled the first of Q. Marie, but reestablished the first of Q. Elizabeth, and confirmed the eight yeare of her raigne. So that*

ministers of England are ordered according to that booke, concerning which I would know (saith he) *wherein it transgresseth the ecclesiasticall manner.*

1. Where if M. Mason had opened his mind so farre, as to haue told what he meaneth by ecclesiasticall manner, it would not be hard to shew him that which he demaundeth. For if he vnderstand by ecclesiasticall manner, those words and actions only, which are expressed in holy scripture: his puritane brethren will saue vs a labour: for they will shew him, that it transgresseth the ecclesiasticall manner in many things. For example, the Litanies, the himne come holieghost, the oath of supremacie, all the set praiers prescribed in the rituall, none of all which haue any warrant in the scripture. And which is more: the formes of words vsed together with the impositiō of hands aswell in ordering Deacons, as Priests, and Bishops, are without all warrant of holy scripture. For where are these words vsed in making Deacōs, found in all the whole Bible? *Take thou authoritie to execute the office of a Deacon, in the church of God committed vnto thee: In the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holie Ghost:* or that the Bishop deliuering vnto him the new testament should say: *Take thou authority to reade the Gospell in the church of God, and to preach the same, if thou be thereunto ordinarily commaunded.* Or where is it recorded, that the Apostles in ordering of Priests either vsed, or appointed these words to be vsed? *Receiue the holy Ghost, whose sinnes thou dost forgiue, they are forgiuen, and whose sins thou dost retaine, they are retained, and be thou a faithfull dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments, In the name of the father and of the sonne, and of the holy Ghost.* Or where the Apostles deliuered them the Bible with these words. *Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments in this congregation, where thou shalt be so appointed.* Where is to be noted an absurd repetition of the same authoritie, of ministring sacraments giuen before; which repetition in matter of sacraments, is sacrilegious, except in case of doubt of the validitie of the former, by some accident extraordinarilie occurring. And in the consecration of Bishops, where are these words prescribed by holy scripture? *Take the holy Ghost: and remember that thou stirre vp the grace of God, which is in thee by imposition of hands, for God hath not giuen vs the spirit of feare, but of power, and loue, and sobernes.*

All this is in their rituall, or manner of making Bishops, Priests, and Deacons printed at London 1607

If M. Maſon thinke to anſwere, that moſt of theſe words are the words of the holie ſcripture, and ſeeme to be fitlie applied to this purpoſe: he ſhall nothing ſatisfie. For beſides that infinite other words of holie ſcripture might be as fitlie, and more fitlie applied to the ſame purpoſe, then manie of theſe, which notwithſtanding, I ſuppoſe M. Maſon will not ſaie, are anie ſufficient forme of holie order, vnles he will admitt manie formes of the ſame thing: (a propoſition neuer heard of either in Diuinitie, or Philoſophie) beſides this I ſaie, it being manifeſt, that by holie order (whether it be a Sacrament or no) is giuen power to exerciſe certaine eccleſiaſticall and Spirituall actions, which haue their effect in our ſoules, and in Gods Sacraments: which power cannot be giuen by anie man or anie other meanes, but ſuch as our ſaviour Chriſt the author therof hath ordained for that purpoſe. M. Maſon muſt either ſhew theſe words, and actions now repeated to haue bene inſtituted by our Sauiour Chriſt, as the lawfull meanes of giuing holie order, or els muſt he neceſſarilie confeſſe them, to be euidentlie ſacrilegious and ſuperſtitious: Sacrilegious, as an irreuerent abuſe of holie things: Superſtitious as applying or aſcribing an holie power to a thing that hath none at all. And ſeeing it is manifeſt, that M. Maſon cānot shew by holie ſcripture, that our Sauiour Chriſt hath inſtituted theſe formes of holie orders, and that in all other points of faith and religion, he reiecteth the authoritie of traditions (and therfore cānot with anie shew of honeſtie recurre vnto them in this particulet, though they fauoured him neuer ſo much) my witt, I confeſſe, is too short or shallow to conceiue, how M. Maſon can iuſtifie this their forme, and mānер of making Bishops, Prieſts, and Deacons from euident ſacrilege and ſuperſtition or at leaſt mere human inuentious euen by his own iudgment deliuerered vpon the ſame matter in theſe words: *Doe you meane that the oyle, wherwith the head (of the Bishop) is annointed with theſe words, be thy head annointed and conſecrated with celeſtiall benediction: or the ring bleſſed with prayer and holy water, and put vpon his fingar with theſe words: receiue the ring, the ſeal of faith: Or the croſier deliuered with theſe words: receiue the ſtaff of the paſtorall office: do you meane that theſe or the like belong to the offence of epiſcopall conſecration? If you doe: you muſt giue vs leaue to reiect them, becauſe they are only humā inuentions. The matter of ordination as you ſay is certayne and determined of God: now where ſhall we find the determination of God but in the booke of God.*

When you can demonstrate your rings and crosiers out of the booke of God we will accept them, in the mean while we cannot admitt them as essentiall matter of ordination: thus fare are his own words pag. 95.

If we showld now pay him with his owne coine, howe cowld he possibly iustify theyr newe ordinations? by no means can he doe it. But as in other points hertofore, we haue dealt liberallie with M. Mason and his felow reformists permitting them to recurre to the forrres of Catholique doctrine, when they could find no refuge in their owne: So likewise in this particuler will I giue him leaue to haue recourse to traditions, and to seeke refuge there, for the iustification of their orders.

If therfore he say, that he meaneth by *ecclesiasticall manner* that, which hath bene vsed in the church from the beginning, and is brought downe from the Apostles to vs, by a nott interrupted tradition; his meaning is good, and such as it should be in this point. But it is so euident, that their manner of making Bishops, and priests is so different, from the ecclesiasticall manner according to this meaning that I much maruell at M. Masons either boldnes, or blindnes, when he saith, *I would know, wherin it transgresseth the ecclesiasticall manner*. If M. Mason would but confer their māner of ordering Bishops, and Priests, with that of the Romane church, (which because he cannot shew to haue begunne sinte the Apostles times, he maie safelie with S. Augustine beleeue it to come from them) he will find it to trangresse the ecclesiasticall māner in so manie things, that it doth not agree therwith in anie one, vnles peraduenture in a small shadowe, or semblance of words not the same, but diuerse. This needeth no other proofe then the confronting of their rituall, with that of the Romane church, which I will leaue to M. Maso to do, if he make doubt therof, and will expect his disproofe therin. Or if he think not good to cōpare their maner of ordination with that of the Roman church, let him bring forth some other if he can, more auncient then it, wherwith theirs doth aggree, and he shall satisfy.

Secondlie the words of the statute before rehearsed, if he had not ouer looked them, would easilie haue instructed him in this his demaund. For if the new church hatched in king Edwards time, had approoued the ecclesiasticall māner of making Bishops and priests, it had bene needles, and verie superfluous, to haue

imploied the prelates and learned in Gods law, *to deuise* (marke I pray you this word *deuise*, which is the verie word of the statute, if M. Poulton relate it trulie) a new forme and manner. Hereby M. Mason may see, and all others that haue eies and will see, that their newlie deuised manner of consecrating Bishops and priests (which he confesseth to be obserued till this daie, and that all their ministers are no otherwise ordered) is a meere humane deuise and inuention, (and therfore by his owne iudgment to be reiected) but of yesterdaies standing neither authorised by scripture, nor approoued by ecclesiasticall tradition, a meere shadow without substance, inuented by giddie heads, and vnquiet Spirits greedie of noueltie, authorised first by the temporall power of a child in noneage, and after confirmed by the like authoritie of a woman, contrarie to the practise of the whose Christian world present, and without instance or example in anie age for aboue fifteene hundred yeares. And therfore doth M Mason discouer to much his blind affection, when he saith, *I would know wherin it transgresseth the ecclesiasticall manner.*

Pag. 95. fine.

6 M. Mason to his former words addeth, *Sanders saith, that King Edward tooke awaie the ceremonie. what ceremonie? If he meane the ceremonie of imposition of hands, he slaundreth King Edward: If he meane their blessings, offerings, and crosiers; the grauitie of that sacred act we may well spare them: as for the solemne vnction, your selues confesse it to be accidentall, other of your ceremonies being partlie superfluous, partlie superstitious: the wisdome of our church hath discretlie and religiouslie pared them away, establishing* (marke this) *such a forme, as is holie and acceptable in Gods sight.*

Sanders doth not speake of taking awaie anie ceremonies, but saith directlie, that altogether a new forme of ordering was prescribed by parlement, in King Edwards daies, which appearing to be true by the same forme yet obserued, as M. Mason confesseth, Saunders doth not slaunder King Edward, but M. Mason either slaudereth or corrupteth Saunders. But why doth he not here set downe, by what authoritie the wisdome of their church doth shaue, and pare awaie such large portions of those holie rites, which the wisdome of the vniuersall church of Christ hath so long obserued, that the beginning therof cannot be found, and in their steede hath established a new forme of their owne inuention, that is not so old as themselues, and their

litle older then King Edward the sixt. Can anie man of iudgment thinke, that these men haue anie sparke of Christian religion in them? or the least reuerence to the misteries of Gods holie church? who make no scruple to cut and pare, chop and chaunge in the holiest actiõs, whatsoeuer their fancie disliketh? these men I saie, that breath nothing but scripture: *O ye Sons of men how long will you loue vanitie and seeke after lies?* Psal. 4. 3.

M. Mason for all this in the two pages following earnestlie contendeth, that the church of England (notwithstanding the alteration made in the manner of ordination) still retaineth the essentiall matter of Episcopall order: to wit, imposition of hãds: and likewise the essentiall forme of the same order, consisting (as he saith) in these words: *Receiue thou the holie ghost*: whence it will necessarilie fallow, that they are true Bishops. But he neither prooueth that these two things here mentoined belong to the essentiall matter, and forme of Episcopall order, nor yet that nothing els belongeth therunto. And yet the veritie of both these points doth so much import, to the triall of the question in hand, that if either of them should be found false, our English superintendents will euidentlie be prooued no lawfull Bishops, and consequentlie M. Mason shall fall farr short of his purpose here aimed att. Wherfore it behooued him to haue made some better proofe of them, then his owne bare assertion. And seeing the proofe of these thing belongeth euidentlie to him, as maintaining the affirmatiue, and that therfore no mã can iustlie exact, or expect anie more of me in this particular then that which perraineth to the defendant, which is onlie to answere the argumẽts of mine aduersarie. Yet notwithstanding in assurãce that the cleare truth stãdeth on my side, I will willinglie, heerin make my selfe actor, and prooue against him the negatiue of his assertion: which for more distinct, and clare manner of proceding, and to auoide the tediousnes of lõg chapters, I will handle apart vnder this title. Pag. 95. and 96.

The

The thirteenth Chapter.

The whole essentiall matter, and forme of Episcopall order consist not in imposition of hands, and these wordes, receiue thou the holie ghost.

1. FOr the more easie explication of this question, it is first to be obserued, that the precise matter and forme of no one Sacrament is so clearlie expressed in holie scripture, but that without the authoritie of the church, and tradition, there maie be doubt, and question made therof. This is euident euen in Baptisme it selfe. For this forme N. *I baptise thee in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holie ghost* which is vsed in all the west church: Or this forme, *Be the seruant of Christ baptized in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holie ghost*, which is vsed in the east church, is no where in these tearmes expressed in the holie scripture. The same I sait of the matter, which all men hold to be elementall, or naturall water, and no other, which notwithstanding is no where expreslie prescribed in holie scripture. The precise matter and forme likewise of the holy Eucharist, are not so expressly sett down in holy scripture but (were it not fore the churches auctoritie) there might, as also there haue beeue questions therof. And here by the way it may be noted, how necessarie the authoritie of the church and tradition is, for the supporte of the verie grounds of Christian faith and doctrine: and that therfore not without cause S. Paul stileth the church *the piller: and grounde of truth.*

1. Timoth. 3.15. 2. Secondlie it is to be obserued, that the precise matter, and forme of diuers Sacraments, and amongst others of holie orders (which according to Catholique doctrine I suppose to be a Sacrament, because this doth neither aduantage me, nor disaduantage mine aduersarie in the present question) are not so expressed either in anie Councell, or the aunciēt fathers, but that there are diuers probable opinions in the same, according to the probable grounds that are found, either in reason or authoritie. For the holie councells and fathers not making ritualls, nor

explic-

explicating at large the whole order, or manner of ministring all Sacraments, but deliuering to their posteritie the practise of that manner, which they receiued from their Predecessors, do not prescribe in what precise things, actions, or words the matter and forme of all Sacraments de consist, nor of this in particuler, which now is in question. Hence it commeth, that those Catholique Doctors, that haue had occasion to treate of this matter, finding no precise rule prescribed vnto them, neither in the scriptures, Councells, nor Fathers, haue deliuered their iudgment thervpon diuersitie, according to the diuers grounds which euerie one thinketh most probable. And therfore if any showld say that the essentiall matter of Episcopall order is the only imposition of hands (which notwithstanding I find not affirmed by any but one only auctor) others will ioyne thervnto the vnction vsed in that action, and also the deliuerie of those things which are exhibited in consecration, as the booke of Gospels, the Pastorall staffe, and ring: Others excluding the imposition of hands from the order of priesthood, as not pertayning to the essence therof and therfore seeme also to exclude it from the essentiall matter of episcopall order: none of these opinions touching the matter showld be certainlie false, nor yet any of them certainlie true. And becaus the common iudgment of the forme of holie order is, that it consisteth in those words, which declare the power of the order giuen, and are vttered when the matter is deliuered, the forme likewise of episcopall order commeth to be in such sort vncertaine, as it is not certainlie knowne in which wordes precisely it doth consist.

Neither doth the church of God suffer anie detriment hereby being assured, that she hath the true matter and forme, which the Apostles deliuered her from our sauiour Christ, though it be not knowne in what words, or actions precisely they do consist: as it happeneth in like vncertaintie, and diuersitie of opinions, about the precise matter and forme of matrimonie, some saying the matter therof to be the mutuall consent of the partie, expressed by words of the present tense, and forme to be the words of the priest ioyning thē together: others, that the persōs cōtracting are the matter, and the words expressing their cōsents, the forme: others that the words of the persōs cōtracting are both matter & forme in such sort, as the words of that partie,

Cā. de locis l. 8. cap. 5. Palud. in 4. di. 26. qu. 4. Adrian. qu. 1. de matri.

that last expresseth his consent, are the forme, and thothers that went before, the matter, so S. Thomas, and Victoria: others, that the matter is the mutuall, and inward consent of the parties contracting the forme, the words of the same parties expressing the same consent, so the Canonists commonlie and Nauarre: all which diuersitie of opinions in this precise point, doth bring no inconuenience at all to the church, or Christiã common wealth, so long as nothing is omitted, that by anie opinion belongeth to the true matter, and forme. But if anie one should be so peremptorie in his priuate opinion, as to exclude all other but that, which he thinketh the true matter, and forme, he should make all marriages doubtfull, which must needs bring great inconuenience to the whole Christian world, as all men euidentlie see: And this is true whether matrimonie be a Sacrement or no: for that doth neither help nor hinder in this present questiõ. The like or greater inconuenience doth necessarilie follow in the whole church, if all her pastors, and ministers should be ordered with such matter, and forme, as in some mens opinion onlie is true, and not in others. For if it should prooue, that their opinion should be true, that hold imposition of hands, and these words *Receiue the holie Ghost*; are not the true matter and forme of this order, then would it necessarilie follow, that such as should be ordained therwith are no true Bishops. Seeing therfore M. Mason is not ignorant of this varietie of opinions in this present questiõ (which he relateth in part) and himselfe bringeth no better, not yet so good ground of his opinion, as others do of theirs, it is marueile vnto mee, that he should so perẽptorilie saie, that their Bishops are ordered with the true matter, and forme. But he doth well to be bold in affirminge, for a good face sometimes helpeth out an ill game.

In 4. di. 26. q. 2. ar. 1. qu. 245. de Sacramentis. In caput. tuanos. extra de sponsalibus. Manuale ca. 22. n. 20.

He citeth Salmeron Incarnatus, Nauarre, Soto, for the contrary opinion, and might haue added others: citing onlie Bellarmin for thisowne, and him falslie, pag. 95. Conclusion.

3. My conclusion is, that the sole imposition of hãds with these words, *Receiue the holie Ghost*, is not the whole, true, and essentiall matter and forme of Episcopall order, and consequentlie, that those, that are ordained with them alone, as our English superintendents are confessed to be, are not trulie ordained, nor are anie true Bishops. This conclusion I prooue first by this negatiue argumẽt. Neither scriptures, Councells, Fathers, nor Diuines one only escepted doe teach, that the sole impositiõ of hãds, and these words *Receiue the holie ghost*, are the whole essential matter,

and forme of Episcopall order: therfore is it affirmed without ground. Bellarmine doth prooue in the place alleaged by M. Mason, that imposition of hands doth belong to the essentiall matter of preesthood, but he ioyneth therwith as more principall the deliuerie of the chalice, with the paten and host, and of the matter of Episcopall order, he saith nothing. And M. Maton bringeth foure other Catholique authors, that exclude imposition of hands, from the essentiall matter of holie order, which sheweth that it is but propable at the most, that imposition of hands pertaineth, to the essentiall matter of holie order: but that it should be the whole and sole essentiall matter, is no waie probable. Neither do I thinke M. Mason would saie it were probable, but that he is forced vnto it, not hauing other meanes to maintaine for good, the newly deuised maner of ordination of their Bishops, whervpon I appeale to his owne iudgment, whether that manner of ordination, deuised by the sixe Prelats, and other six learned in the law of God, appointed by King Edward for that purpose, is more like to be that manner of ordination, which the Apostles themselues vsed, and left vnto their successours, then that which was ouer and is still vsed thorow the whole Christian church. *De sacram. tis ordinis lib. 1. c. 9.*

4. Againe whether this new forme of ordination was established by parlement, vpon anie grounded persuasion, that it was conformable to the manner vsed by the Apostles: or rather as a meane both to leaue the Catholique manner, and yet to retaine some externall semblance of ordination, the world being not yet readie to receiue the refined reformation, which we see smee to haue crept in amongst those, that haue apostated from the vnion of the Catholique Romane church, and by which is reiected as superstitious, not onlie this parlementarie fashion of ordination but the verie order of Bishops it selfe it is not verie doubtfull. And that this second was the drift at least of him, that first put into mens hartes the reuolt, and separation from the vnitie of the Catholique church, it is plaine enough by the booke called; *the forme and manner of ordination, and admission of Pastors to their church, according to the manner of the reformed churches: Printed at* Middelberrough by *Richard S. Hilders* 1602. which prescribeth quite another fashiō of ordinatiō, thē that of the parlemēt of king Edward, and maketh a new Hierarchie of the church to wit,

of Elders, Deacons, and ministers, Bishops, being esteemed by them, as all the world knoweth, Antichristian instrumets. Whose senseles and absurd heresies I see not, but M. Mason and his fellowes must accept of, and acknowledge for necessarie reformations, by the same rule, that they pretend to haue reformed the Catholique Romane church. But I will proceed in the proofe of my conclusion.

5. Secondly the vniforme doctrine of those that haue written of holie order tracteth, that the matter thereof consisteth in the deliuerie of the instruments proper to euerie order, as of Deaconship the booke of the Gospells; of priesthood the chalice, and paten with the host, and so in the other orders: And that the forme consisteth in those words, which are vttered together with the deliuerie of the matter, and expresse the authoritie giuen by the same, which in deaconship are these. *Take power to reade the Gospell in the church of God, as well for the liuing as for the dead, in the name of our lord Amen.* In preisthood they are these. *Take power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masse as well for the liuing as for the dead, in the name of our lord. Amen.* And the like in the rest of holy orders. Therfore Episcopall order ought in all reason, to haue like matter and forme, which cannot be imposition of hands, and these words *Receiue the holie Ghost*, because neither the one, nor the other apart, nor yet both together do expresse the power giuen in that order: but they rather ex presse the giuing of the holie Ghost, whereby the consecrated is disposed or made fitt, to exercise well, and worthilie the power and authoritie giuen by that order.

Thirdly seing there want not in Episcopall consecration, the like sensible matter, and signifying forme, which are of all deuines confessed to be the essentiall matter and forme of other orders. As for example, the anointing of the head of him that is cōsecrated with holie chrisme, with these words *Be thy head anointed, and consecrated with heauenlie blessing in Episcopall order:* Besides are deliuered him the pastorall staffe, the ring, the booke of Gospels, all with seuerall words aptlie expressing the power giuen by that order, it is most probable that they pertaine to the essentiall matter, and forme of this order, I saie most probable, because we haue nothing clearlie certaine in this point, neither by scriptures, Councells, nor Fathers, as is before noted.

And this doctrine for as much as concerneth the anointing of the Bishops head, which seemeth to some least probable, is confirmed by the testimonie of most ancient Fathers. For S. Clement Pope and disciple of the Apostles saith, *that euery Bishop anointed with holy chrisme, placed in the city, and learned in holy scriptures, ought to be deare, and honoured of all men.* And Pacianus of equall antiquitie with S. Ambrose, whence (saith he) *can your people haue the holy Ghost, whom an anointed Priest hath not confirmed?* Whereby this holy Father seemeth to ascribe the giuing of the holy Ghost in confirmation, to the vnction of the Bishop that giueth it; and therfore must of necessitie esteeme it to be essentiall to be Episcopall order.

Epist. 3 ad vniuersos.

Epist. 3. ad Sympronian: The same may we say to our English superintendents.

I know that a certaine schooleman of these daies holdeth for probable that the imposition of hands, and these words *accipe Spiritum Sanctũ* are the true matter and forme of Episcopall order. His grounds are these. First that at the least three Bishops are by diuine ordinaunce necessarie to Episcopall cõsecration. Secõdly. that it is necessary that the true minister of holy order apply the matter of order vnto the ordered, and therfore if one only Bishop apply the matter of Episcopall order it is not sufficiẽt, because one Bishop alone (without cõmission giuen him for that purpose) is not the true minister of that order. Thirdly that only that action of imposing hands is performed by all the three Bishops. Wherupon he inferreth that that action is the true matter, and the words pronounced together with the same, are the forme of Episcopall consecration. How true or probable his discourse is, I meane not here to dispute, but (be the grounds therof what they will) I will for M. Masons aduãtage suppose the conclusiõ to be probable, which is as much as he can expect, and more then he can exact. Now what will he inferre heervpõ for his purpose.

6. If he say, that his opinion concerning the matter and forme of Episcopall order being probable, it will follow, that their Bishops are at least probably Bishops: I wil answere him: First, that though it be probable, that imposition of hands, and these words *Receiue the holy Ghost* appertaine to the essentiall matter, and forme of Episcopall order, yet is it not probable, that they are the whole essentiall matter and forme therof, because there is no probable ground of this, as it shewed in the first argument against this opinion, and therfore are not their intendents so much as probable Bishops.

Secondlie, be it probable (for the auctority of that one moderne writer nowe mentioned) that the whole essentiall matter, and forme of Episcopall order consist in the imposition of hands, and these words *Receiue the holy Ghost*: and consequently, that their superintendents are probablie Bishops; yet will it not thence follow, that it is so much as probable, that they haue the lawfull calling of Bishops, because the lawfull calling of the Pastors of Gods church doth not hang vpon probabilities, but requireth vnfallible certainties, for so much at least as appertaineth to their essentiall ordination, without including matter of fact: for otherwaies all their actions (as they are Bishops and Pastors) should be but probablie canonicall, and therfore vncertaine, whence would necessarilie rise an irremediable confusion in the church, which notwithstanding is called in the scripture *an armie well ordered*. Therfore he that in ministring, or receiuing holy order, leaueth the knowne, certaine, and receiued matter and forme, and vseth that which is only probable, doth not only commit sacriledge by his temeritie, but is also bound to renew the same action, by the accustomed matter and forme, at least vnder condition or els to supply that which was omitted. For though in humaine and morall actions, which haue no other rule but humane reason, and prudence (which for the most part in matters of difficulty is but probable) it is sufficient, to excuse vs from sinning in them, that we worke according to a probable opinion, yet is it otherwaies in sacramentall actions, which haue not for rule any humane reason, but diuine institution, and ordination, made knowne vnto vs, by the infallible testimony either of the holy scripture, or of the doctrine and practice of the church of Christ, which (as is noted before) is *the piller and ground of truth*.

Cant. 6. 3.

1. Timoth. 3

M. Mason will peraduenture yet farther obiect, that there is no mention made in the holy scriptures, of any other thing appertaining to the essentiall matter, and forme of holy order, but only of imposition of hands, and these words *Receiue the holy Ghost* and therfore are all other things to be reiected as mans inuentions, and not diuine ordinations. But first if he wilbe so rigorous, as to accept of nothing as pertayning to the essentiall matter, and forme of holy order, but that which is expressed in holy scripture as appertaining therunto, without all respect to

the authoritie of the church and ecclesiasticall tradition, then must he reiect the matter, and forme prescribed in their ordinall not only of Deacons, and Priests, which are not expressed in holy scripture, but euen those wherin he would the essentiall matter, and forme of episcopall order to consist. For though these words *Receiue the holy Ghost* are in holy scripture, and that there is often mention made of imposition of hands, yet are these two neuer ioined together in holy scripture, nor prescribed as the matter and forme of Episcopall order. In their doctrine. Whence it followeth, that if M. Mason will either haue Deacons, Priests, or Bishops in their church, he must be forced to giue so much credit to the authoritie of the church and tradition, as to receiue from them, the essentiall matter, and forme of these orders. which being so, he will farther euidentlie find, that their superintendents hauing not bene consecrated with that matter and forme, which the church from ancient times vsed cannot be any true Bishops. Iohn 21.

Againe, the scripture with imposition of hands ioyneth alwaies praier in the ordination of Deacons, Priests, or Bishops, as appeareth in the places cited in the margent, and therfore doth the scripture mention something vsuall in holy orders, besides imposition of hands, and these words *Receiue the holy Ghost.* Now what these praiers were, seeing the scripture doth not specifie them, how can we better know, then by the church, which receiued them of the Apostles? And that they were not these words only, which M. Mason will haue the only essentiall forme of holy order, is manifest by S. Ambrose, saying. *The imposition of hands is misticall words, wherwith the elect is confirmed, and made apt to his function, receiuing authority (his conscience bearing witnes) that he may be bold in our lords steede to offer sacrifice to God.* And S. Hierome. *The imposition of hands is the ordering of clearkes, which is done by praier of the voice, and imposition of the hand.* From all which I inferre, that although it be not certaine, what words or actions precislie are the essentiall matter, and forme of episcopall order, as is before noted, yet is it euident, that the matter and forme assigned by M. Mason, is not sufficient to the true ordination of Bishops, being more then doubtfull, not to be the whole true matter and forme, and consequentlie, the ordinations of their superintendents made therby to be esteemed none at all. And that *Acts 6. 6. and cap. 13. 3* *In 1. Timoth. 4.* *In Esay 1. cap. 58.*

that this is the iudgment of all those both Catholiques and Protestants, who ought to haue knowne best the manner of their ordination, I will prooue by two or three cleare argements.

Acts pag. 1604. 1634 page

Firſt M. Fox ſpeaking of the degredation of Ridley (one of those that were made Bishops in King Edwards dayes, and consecrated after this new manner as M. Maſon ſuppoſeth) ſaith, that Doctor Brooke, Bishop of Gloceſter delegated for that action of degredation told him, *that they were to degrade him only of Prieſthood, for that they did not take him for a Bishop.* But if he had bene truly ordered, they could not haue denied him to haue bene a true Bishop, no more then Cranmer, whom they degraded as Archbishop. To this propoſition of the Bishop of Gloceſter, Ridley replied not one word, nor pleaded any thing to the contrary, but by his ſilence shewed, that he conſented thervnto, according to the receiued maxime, *Qui tacet, conſentire videtur.* In which caſe he would not doubtles haue bene ſo mute (ſeeing he wanted not words in other occaſions of farre leſſe moment) had he not knowne himſelfe to haue beene no true Bishop not truly conſecrated. Where it is to be obſerued, that

Pap 92.

M. Maſon bringeth this very obiection of D. Brookes words to Ridley, againſt the conſecration of thoſe, that were ordered in K. Edwards time, and confirmeth it greatly, for that he anſwereth it not otherwaies, but by this impertinent queſtion: *what was not he, and all the reſt of them conſecrated by a competent number?* As though the queſtion had beene of the *number* of their conſecrators, and not of the matter and forme of their conſecration it ſelfe.

Acts pag. 1711.

Secondlie M. Fox ſaith, *becauſe that Ridley, Hooper, and Ferrar were not able to make euen with Bishop Firther, it ſeemed that Cranmer ſhould be ioyned to them to fill vp the equalitie.* But if they had bene in M. Foxes opinion true Bishops as well as Cranmer, ſurely their deathes would in his conceipt haue equalled Bishop Fishers: or els Cranmers would not do it, in whom there was nothing more, then there was in them, excepting the true conſecration of a Bishop. So that it appeareth euen by M. Foxes iudgment, that Ridley, and his fellowes were not eſteemed true Bishops, as Cranmer was, and that not for any other defect, then for want of true conſecration. And what iudgment the whole

realme

realme made of the ordinations in king Edwards reigne is euident by this article of Qeene Marie recorded by Foxe. *Item touching such persons as were heertofore promoted to any orders after the new sort and fashion of orders: considering they were not ordered in very deede: the Bishop of the diocesse, finding otherwise sufficiency and abilitie in these men, may supplie that thing which wanted in them before, and then according to his discretion admitt them to minister.* For albeit M. Mason would gather out of these words: (*may supply that thing which wanted in them before*) that they had some part or peece of order by their new manner of ordination. Yet neither doth this serue him to any purpose for the iustification of their calling, nor yet can it stand with these plaine words of the article: *considering they were not ordered in very deed*: for the plaine meaning of the article is that those who had no orders, but such as they had receiued by the new fashion, should (being found fit) be ordered: but such as had receiued some orders before as of Subdeacon or Deacon, and the rest only after the new fashion should haue that they wanted, supplied by their Catholique ordinarie.

Acts and monu. pag. 1295.

Thirdly it is recorded in bookes of lawe cases, that the leases made by the Bishops consecrated in king Edwards time, though confirmed by the Deane and Chapter, were not esteemed auailable, and the reason is giuen, because those Bishops were neuer truly consecrated, and consequentlie neuer true Bishops. The iudges words are these. *Dicitur, que Euesques in tempore Ed. 6. ne fueront sacres & ideo ne fueront Euesques, & ideo lease pur ans, per tiels & conferinde per le Deane & Chapter, ne liera le successeur, car tiels ne vnques fueront Euesques contra de Euesques depriue que fuit Euesques in fait tempore dimissionis, & confirmation fait. viz.: per le Deane & chapter:* which in English word for word is this. *It is said that Bishops in K. Edward the sixth his daies were not consecrated, and therfore were not Bishops, and therfore a lease for yeares made by them, and confirmed by the Deane and Chapter, shall not bind the successour, for such were neuer Bishops. Contrariwise of a Bishop depriued which was Bishop in fact at the time of the letting and confirmation made by the Deane, and Chapter.* And in the margent. *Leas per Euesques nient sacres & per Euesques depriues diuersitie.* That is; *Diuersitie of leases made by Bishops not consecrated, and Bishops depriued.* So that it appeareth by the iudgment aswell of the ciuill, as Ecclesiasticall Magistrates, that the superintendents of King Edwards time were no true Bishops for

Brooks noued cases Placito 463. fol. 101 printed the yeare 1604. by Thorwight with priuiledge.

want of true consecration yea M. Ridley himself (pretended Bishop of London) sueing vnto Q. Marie (as Fox relateth) that the leases made by him, during the time of his vsurpation of that see, might stand good, doth euidently shew, that he either esteemed himselfe, or at least know that others esteemed him not true, or lawfull Bishop. For otherwise he would not haue supplicated for that as a grace and fauour, but would haue demaunded it as a thing due by right and iustice. Before I proceede any farther, I will aduertise thee (heedfull reader) that albeit the arguments following are directly against the consecration of the Bishops in Q. Elizabeths time, yet haue they the same force against those of King Edwards time, for they were al ordered after the same manner, as is euident by the statute of the 8. of Elizabeth, which shalbe set downe by and by, which I would haue to be borne in mind, that it may not be needfull to repeate the same things hereafter, when we shall come to speake of the Bishops made in herre time.

8. My fourth argument therfore, prouing all these pretended Bishops to haue bene no true and lawfull Bishops, euen by the iudgment of the Protestants themselues is drawne frō that notorious, and publique case of Bishop Bōner, which was this.

Bishop Bonner being prisoner in the Marshalsae was conuented by M. Horne, called then Bishop of Winchester, and lodging at that tyme in Winchester house by the clinke, who tendered to him the oath of supremacie, which Bishop Bonner refusing, his refusall was certified to the Kings bench, and thervpon an inditement was drawne against him vpon the statute. He was called for, and appeared before the iudges of the Kings bench. The inditement being reade he denied not the fact, but desired to haue councell assigned him, Iudge Catline chiefe Iustice granted his request, and assigned him M. Plowdon, M. Wray, and M. Louelaise, who at the pleading of the case excepted against the inditement. First, because he was indited by the name of Edmond Bonner without the title of Bishop, he being at that present lawfull Bishop of London, and therfore the inditment insufficient. Secondly, because the oath was said to haue bene tendered vnto him by Robert Horne Bishop of Winchester, who was by no law Bishop, and therfore had no authoritie to tender him the oath. These points were first

argued

argued at the barre by the Bishops councell, and after by all the iudges at Sargeants Inne in Fleetstreete, in Iudge Catline, the chiefe Iustice his chamber, where, after much debate as Iudge Pyer reporteth it was resolued by all the iudges, that Bishop Bonner his plea vpon this issue; that he was not culpable because Horne was no Bishop when he tendered him the oath, shonld be receiued: and that the iury should try it: nowe what the triall was, appeareth by that he was not condemned nor euer troubled any farther for that case: thaugh he was a man specially shot at. Hereupon in the next parlement, which was holden the yeare folowing to wit the 8. yeare of Elizabeth (and this may be another argument, for prose of the nullitie of these new superintendents) this act was made.

Abrigment of Diers reports 7. Eliza. 234.

9. *Such forme and order, for the consecrting of Archbishops, Bishops, Preists &c. as was set forth in the time of King Edward the sixth shall stand, and be in full force and effect, and all acts and things hertofore had, made, or done by any person, or persons in or about any consecration, confirmation, or inuesting of any person, or persons, elected to the office or dignity of Archbishop, Bishop, —— by vertue of the Queenes letters patents, or commission, sithence, the beginning of her raigne, be and shalbe by authority of this parlement declared and iudged —— good and perfect in all respects, and purposes: any matter or thing that can or may be obiected to the contrary therof in any wise, notwithstanding. And all persons that haue bene or shalbe made, ordered or, consecrated Archbishops, Bishops, Priests after the forme and order prescribed, in the same forme and order, be in very deede and also by authority hereof declared, and enacted to be, and shalbe Archbishops, Bishops, Priests &c. and rightly made, ordered and consecrated any Statute, Law, Canon, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding 8. Eliza. 1.*

Poulton in his kalender pag. 141. n. 5.

In the 39. yeare of Elizabeth, there were also two other statutes made, the one for the ratifying, and making good in law the depositions, and depriuations of Archbishops, Bishops, and Deanes, from the beginning of her raigne till the tenth day of November in the 4. yeare of the same: and thother for the ratifying, and making good in law the placing of other Archbishops, Bishops, and Deanes, in the roomes of the deposed with in the compasse of the same time, no ambiguitie or question either hertofore made, or hereafter to be made, to the contrarie notwithstanding.

Poulton ibidem.

This statute doth argue that the former statute of the 8. of Eliza. did not wholly warrāt these newe Bishops for if it hadd, this would haue bene superfluous.

By all which it is manifest, that the Bishops ordained aswell in

in King Edwards time, as in Q. Elizabeths, were not otherwise Bishops, but by act of parlement, for before these acts, they were iudged by the fathers of the law to be no Bishops, as we haue already seene.

Lib. 3 de schismate Mason pag. 121.

10. M. Mason peraduenture will vnty vs this knot, let vs heare what he saith. He maketh to himselfe this obiection out of Sanders. *They* (Mathew Parker with his fellowes) *being destitute of all lawfull ordination, when they were commonly said, and proued by the lawes of England to be no Bishops, they were constrained to craue the assistance of the secular power that they might receiue the confirmation of the Lay Magistrate in the next parlement, by authority wherof if any thing were done amisse, and not according to the prescript of the law, or omitted and left vndone in the former inauguration, it might be pardoned them: And that, after they had enioied the Episcopall office, and chaire certaine yeares without any Episcopall consecration. Hence it was that they were called Parlement Bishops.* Hereunto M. Mason frameth this answere.

Pag. 122. *The Parlement mentioned was in the 8. yeare of Q. Elizabeth, wherin first they reprooue the ouermuch boldnes of some, which slandered the estate of the cleargy, by calling into question, whether their making and consecrating were according to the lawe.*

Well then their consecration was questionable, and doubtfull, and therfore (though there had bene no other cause) to be reiected. For what wisdome could it be after 1500. yeares to bring into the world, a new manner of ordination of Pastors, and that doubtfull whether it be sufficient or no, and to leaue of that, which no man euer doubted of? But farther it was not only called into question, but as it appeareth before, prooued to be none at all.

Mason ibidem. *Secondly, they touch such lawes as concerne the point, declaring that euery thing requisite and materiall, was done as precisely in her Maiesties time, as euer before.*

But what lawes were these? Certainly they could be none other thē those made in Ed. the 6. his raigne. For if any other be ment, both the parlement, and M. Mason should avouch a manifest vntruth, saying, *that euery thing requisite and materiall, was done as precisely in her maiesties time, as euer before:* seeing there was nothing obserued of the auncient forme, and manner, which before K. Edwards time was not altered. The lawes therfore here mentioned must necessarily be those of K. Edward. But the question

queſtiō in the parlement of the 8. of Elizabeth being, as yet it is, of the validitie, and ſufficiēcy of that forme of ordinatiō deuiſed in K. Edwards time, it doth no way appeare, how either the parlemēt thē did, or M. Maſō now doth ſhew it to be ſufficiēt, but onlie by force of that act, wherof we now ſpeake: which notwithſtāding (as M. Maſon ſuppoſeth) giueth no force, nor valour to their cōſecration, nor maketh it good, but ſuppoſeth it to be good of it ſelfe; ſo that betwixt both theſe acts of parlement, I meane that of K. Edward, and tother of Q. Elizabeth, their new manner of conſecration remaineth as ſufficient as euer.

Thirdlie, they confirme againe the booke of common praier, with the forme Maſon.
therunto annexed, enacting that all perſons, that then had bene, or hereafter ſhould be made, ordered, or conſecrated Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Prieſts &c. after the forme and order herein preſcribed, were by authoritie therof declared, and enacted to be Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and Prieſts &c. rightlie made, ordered, and conſecrated, anie Statute, Law, Canon, or other thing to the contrarie notwithſtanding. Wherby it is euident, that the parlement did not make them Biſhops, but being in verie deed true Biſhops by lawfull conſecration, that honorable court did declare, and enact them ſo to be. But what ſaie the Papiſts to all this? when they cannot infringe their conſecration, for a poore reuange they call our religion parlement religion, and our Biſhops parlement Biſhops.

If they had bene in verie deede true Biſhops by lawfull conſecration, this act of parlement (being onlie to declare that to be good and lawfull, which in it ſelfe was ſuch, and which the prince, and parlement had power to maintaine as ſuch, by ordinary courſe of law without any new act) ſhould haue bene wholy ſuperfluous (a thing not to be admitted in actes of parlemēt) for no act was euer made onlie to declare that good and lawfull, which was knowne or holden to be ſo before by the learned councell of the land.

Secondlie theſe words of the ſtatute. *All perſons that haue bene, or ſhalbe made, ordered, or conſecrated Archbiſhops, Biſhops &c. after the forme preſcribed in the ſaid order* (of Edward the 6.) *be in verie deede, and alſo by authoritie hereof declared, and enacted to be, and ſhalbe Archbiſhops, Biſhops &c. and rightlie made, ordered, and conſecrated, anie Statute, Law, Canon, or other thing to the contrarie notwithſtanding.* Theſe words, I ſaie, do clearelie ſhew, that this act doth not onlie declare theſe ordinations to be good (which yet is more then it can do, being but the decree of a temporall court) but doth enact, and if it could)

could) make them good, and that so peremptorilie, that no law neither deuine nor humane (for so much do importe these words, *Statute, Law, Canon, or other thing*) can withstand it. A peereles power I wisse, and such as was neuer heard of before in any Christian common wealth: yet such an one, as is altogether necessarie to make the aforesaid ordinations good. For if the power of the parlement be not aboue the power both of the whole church, and of God himselfe, these ordinations warranted neither by Gods word, nor the practise of the church for 1500. Yeares and more, must necessarilie be none at all; and therfore with verie good reason are their Bishops called *parlement Bishops*, seeing their manner of ordination was first instituted by act of parlement and since the ordination it selfe, hath receiued the force of true ordination, by act of parlement, which it had not before. For if we should take awaie the statute of the 5. and 6. yeare of Edward the 6. establishing the new forme of ordering Bishops, deuised by the six prelates, and other six learned in Gods law, as we haue seene before; and this statute of the 8. of Elizabeth, I marueile whence M. Mason would deriue their ordination, and by what authoritie he would maintaine it to be good and Canonicall. Certainlie by none either in heauen, or in earth. Yea if their owne Iudges, professours of their owne new religion, supported by the countenance and fauour of the Queene her selfe, and whole state, could not by law maintaine their new ordination from nullitie in their owne courts, but that it was euicted against them, as appeareth by the case of B. Bonner set downe before (whervpon was made this peremptorie, and beyond all measure presumptuous all of the 8. of Elizabeth) who can deny, but if we take awaie this act, their ordination will remaine none, and consequentlie their Bishops no Bishops, and therfore if they now be Bishops, they must necessarilie be parlement Bishops.

11. M. Mason not finding anie colourable answere herevnto, notwithstanding the flant of words, which we haue seene before, would willinglie retort the same inconuenience vpon Catholiques in this wise. *Might not we saie as well that in Queene Maries time, you had a parlement masse, and a parlement Pope?* But I appeale to his owne iudgment (though I know him blindlie partiall in his owne cause) whether there be the like comparison betweene the

the Masse, or the Popes authoritie, and the parlemẽt in Q. Maries time, that there is betweene the forme, or manner of consecrating Bishops, *deuised and authorised* (I vse the words of the statute) in K. Edw. and Q. Elizab. time? If he saie yea, he shall forfaict his iudgmẽt for euer. For who knoweth not, that the Masse, and the Popes authoritie were not onlie in England, but all the world ouer, many hundreth yeares before Q. Maries raigne? which cannot be said of their new forme of ordaining Bishops. For Q. Marie did not enact by parlement, that the Masse should be a true Masse, and the Popes authoritie a true authoritie, what law, or other thing to the contrarie notwithstanding, as this act of Q. Elizabeth saith of the new superintendents and of their manner of consecration: But her act was to authorise the free vse, and frequentatiõ of the Masse, with the acknowledgment of the Popes authoritie in her kingdone, which all her roiall progenitors, and predecessors had frequented, and acknowledged, since Ethelbert the first Christian king of our countrie togeather with all other kings, and Princes in the Christiã world. So that neither the Masse, nor the Popes authoritie depend otherwaies of the parlement, then that it may be free for euerie subiect of the king of England, to acknowledge both thone and thother, without incurring the penaltie of the temporall lawes. And therfore though the free vse of them may be taken awaie, by vniust and vnlawfull act of parlement, as we see practised, yet can neither thone nor thother be made none by act of parlement, as it would fall out with their superintendents, add the manner of their consecration, if those acts were taken awaie, wherby they are deuised and authorised. And the reason hereof is manifest. For neither the Masse, nor the Popes authoritie haue their beginning and institution by act of parlement, as the ordinations of our new superintendents haue, and therfore can they not be made frustrate, and of no value by anie power of the same, as these may be. Whence it is manifest that by verie good reason, the pretended Bishops of England are called parlement Bishops, and consequentlie no Bishops at all, because the parlement cannot haue anie power to make Bishops: and that without all reason, or shew of reason, the Masse is said to be a parlement masse. But let vs goe for word.

Sixtlie, the nullitie of this new manner of consecration

is

is proued by an obiection, which M. Maſon bringeth againſt himſelf, and anſweareth it not. The obiection he propoſeth thus.

Pag. 132. *If their conſecrations were ſound* (he ſpeaketh of D. Parker and his fellowes conſecrated in the 2. and 3. yeare of Q. Elizabeth as he ſaith) *Why did the Queene in her letters patents directed for the conſecrating of them vſe diuers generall words and ſentences, whereby ſhe diſpenſed with all cauſes, or doubts of anie imperfection, or diſhabilitie, that could or might be obiected in anie wiſe againſt the ſame, as may appeare by an* (a) *act of parlement, referring vs to the ſaid letters patents remaining vpon recorde.*

a 8. Eliz. ca. 1 f

M. Maſon finding no ſufficient anſwere to this obiection (though not preſſed ſo farr, as if he had ſet downe theſe letters patēts, peraduenture he might be) recurreth to the depth of her Maieſties deſignes, and hideth himſelf there, as in a Sanctuarie: whither he thinketh no mā dareth aproach to giue him the purſuite, and thence as from a ſure hold he deliuereth his coniecture in theſe words.

She might entertaine ſome reaſon in her Roiall breſt, which you and I, and ſuch ſhallow heads are not able to conceiue: But if I might preſume to giue my coniecture, I ſuppoſe ſhe did it ad maiorem cautelam: *for there wanted not malicious Papiſts, which would prie into the ſtate of the cleargie, and obſerue the leaſt imperfection that could be, whervpon to preuent their ſlaunders, and to ſtopp the mouthes of malice, that gratious Queene was not onlie carefull, that euerie thing requiſite, and materiall, ſhould be made, and done as preciſelie as euer before, but alſo to the end that all men might be ſatisfied, that all doubt, ſcruple, and ambiguitie might be taken awaie, and that there ſhould not the leaſt ſpot of ſuſpition cleane vnto her cleargie, it pleaſed her maieſtie (if peraduenture quicke ſighted malice could find anie quicke, or quidditie againſt them, by colour of anie Canon or Statute) gratiouſlie to diſpenſe with it: which doth not argue anie vnſaundnes in their conſecrations, but the Godly care, and prouidence of a religious prince.*

But M. Maſons coniecture commeth farre ſhort, of the difficultie contained in the obiection. For either there was ſome true, and reall defect in theſe mens conſecrations, or no. If none it was verie impertinentlie, and imprudentlie done (which in publique acts of princes, and parlements is not to be admitted)

to dispense with all causes, or doubts of any imperfection, or disabilitie, that could, or might be obiected against the same. For the Prince and parlement hauing more then sufficient power, to defend and maintaine that which is well decreed, from all friuolous surmises of any aduersaries, especially their subiects all dispensations in such cases, are not only superfluous, but also pernitious, as opening the way to all cauils against euery decree of the Prince, and parlement. If there were any true, and reall defect in their consecrations (as the former argument euidently concludeth) the Queene hauing no power to dispence therwith, it must necessarilie still remaine, and consequentlie their consecration shall alwaies be defectiue, and insufficient. Or if it be pretended, that the Queene had any such power, Let some ground therof be produced, if not out of scripture (which yet we might iustly exact, seeing they protest to beleeue nothing but that, which is prooued by scripture) yet out of some councell, auncient father, or at least the president of some one approued fact, within the compasse of 1500. yeares. But if no such ground of this power can be produced, as most certainlie it cannot, what man of sense can thinke this dispensation to be of any force? M. Mason with the rest of his brethren thinke it ouermuch to graunt this power to the successour of S. Peter, to whom our Sauiour said: *whatsoeuer thou shalt loose in earth, shalbe loosed in heauen*; and all Catholique Diuines deny him to haue any such power, in the case we heere speake of, which is, of the matter, and forme of holy order. How therfore can they thinke if due to the Queene of England, who if she would haue beene a Christian, must haue beene a sheepe of his fold, to whom the Sauiour of all our soules gaue the charge of feeding his sheepe? This dispensation therfore is so farre from *satisfying all men, or taking away all doubt, scruple, or ambiguitie in these new consecrations*, that it maketh the matter more doubtfull. For no man that doubted either of the power of King Edward to *deuise, and institute* a new forme, and manner of consecrating Bishops, and Preists, neuer knowne before in the church of Christ, or of the valore, and goodnes of the forme it selfe, but must necessarilie doubt of the power of Queene Elizabeth, by any dispensation to ratifie, and make good the same. Neither was it only the malitious Papists

This power of dispensing with all cautions &c. doth not aggree with their doctrin of the only externall coercitiue iurisdiction of the Prince ouer the church: see the Last cap.

Math. 16.

Ioh. 21.

(as it pleaseth M. Mason to tearme them) that obserued this his perfection in these new superintendents, but the Protestant iudges of the realme (as we haue seene before) which whilest the new statists laboured to couer by act of parlement (for they could not be of so weake iudgment, as to thinke by that meanes to take it away) it is made more euident to all the world, no man being so deuoide of sense or vnderstanding, as to dreame only, that the Queene could by any power she had, make those ordinations good and sufficient, which of themselues were not such.

Pag. 133. 13. M. Mason seeing this to be ouercleare to be denied, laboureth to shadow it at least in some sort, saying: *that the Queene did but dispense with the trespasses againg her owne lawes, not in essentiall points of ordination, but only in accidentall: not in substance, but in circumstance. Neither did she giue leaue to make any voluntary violation of the law, but only dispensed, with such omission, as (a) necessity it selfe should require, as may appeare by the letters Patents. And it pleased the almighty so to dispose that all things were performed in most exquisite manner: yet the Papists (such was their hatred against the cleargy) did blaze abroad the contrary. Whereupon the high court of Parlement, assembled in the 1. yeare of that famous Queene, hauing deepely considered and pondered all things, pronounced, that their speeches were slaunderous, not grounded vpon any iust matter, or cause. For Gods name be blessed, all things were done honestly and in order, euen from her first comming to the crowne.*

(a) temporis ratione, & rerum necessitate id postulante.

What any man could say more in this matter I see not, and therfore in mine opinion M. Mason deserueth well his fee. Yet all he saith serueth to little purpose, for the iustification of these new superintendents, as will appeare in the particulers. The *Queene* (saith he) *dispensed with the trespasses against her owne lawes*. He should haue specified the lawes that it might appeare, he plaid not voluntary, and without ground, willing only to shuffle of the matter. But there appeare no such lawes made by her (before this dispense was graunted, which was in the second yeare of her raigne) with the transgressions whereof she might dispense, and therfore must she be thought to haue intended, to dispense with the trespasses of other lawes either of God, or his church, or both, wherwith she could no more dispense then any of her subiects can dispense with her [illegible]

for all parlement lawes, which might make against this new promotion, she repealed in her first parlement, and therfore could not dispense therwith. *She dispensed* (saith he) *not in essentiall points of ordination, but only in accidentall: not in substance, but in circumstance.*

Fopperie, mere fopperie; these words of the letters patents dearelie conuince the contrarie: *we dispense with all causes or doubts, of any imperfection or disability, that can or may bee obiected in any wise against the same.*

Second lie M. Mason saying, *that the wisdome of their church discreetly, and religiously pared away all superfluous, and superstitious ceremonies in ordination*; there appeareth no neede of any dispensation in the accidentall circumstances. For it is not to be thought, that the Queene would dispense with those, which the wisdome of their church retaineth as good, and lawfull. Pag. 11. and 94.

That which he addeth: *the Queene gaue not leaue to make any voluntary violation of the lawe: but only dispensed with such omission, as necessity it selfe would require*: is neither warily, nor truly said. For no dispensation is a leaue to violate the lawe, but a suspension of the obligation therof, that it cannot be violated by doing of that, which the law forbiddeth. It is also vnwarily said of him. For what necessitie could driue them to omit any thing requisite, to the accustomed manner of ordination, excepting only the want of true Bishops, that would consecrate the newly designed and elected Superintendents? Surely no probable appearance of other necessitie can be alleaged, and therfore M. Mason laboring to iustifie this dispensation vnwarily discouereth an essentiall defect in the same, and in steed of making vp the breach, which appeareth in their vocation, doth (contrary to his name) make it greater. But of this point of the want of true Bishops, that might consecrate these new men, we shall speake of D. Parkers ordination. But before I come to that point: I will here add one other argument more to prooue the nullitie of this new ministerie.

14. In this sort. M. Iewell one of the first promoted (or rather) intruded Intendents in Q. Elizabeths time, the most forward, and peraduenture the best able of all the troupe to maintaine his owne and his fellowes ordination did not, nor durst not in his life time deny the nullitie therof, but by his silence

silent dissimulation of his aduersaries more pressing arguments did rather graunt the same. Therfore it is more then probable in any prudent mans iudgment, that their calling is not iustifiable in it selfe and that for want of true consecration. But that the reader may make a more perfect iudgment, of the force of this argument, I will here set downe the dispute betweene D. Harding and M. Iewell vpon this point.

Harding confutation of the Apologie fol 57.58.

Doctor Harding expostulateth with M. Iewell, and demaundeth of him, how he came to be Bishop in this sort. *Therfore to goe from your succession which (a) ye cannot proone and to come to your vocation, how say you sir? You beare your selfe, as though you were Bishop of Salisbury. But how can you proone your vocation? By what authority vsurpe you the administration of doctrine, and sacraments? what can you alleage for the right and proofe of your ministery? who hath laid hands on you? By what example hath he done it? how and by whom are you consecrated? who hath sent you? who hath committed to you the office you take vpon you? Be you a Priest, or be you not? If you be not, how dare you vsurpe the name, and office of a Bishop? If you be, tell vs who gaue you orders? The institution of a Priest was neuer yet but in the power of a Bishop. Bishops haue alwaies after the Apostles time, according to the Ecclesiasticall Canons, bene consecrated by three other Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitane, and confirmation of the Bishop of Rome. Thus vnity hath hitherto bene kept, thus schismes haue bene staied, and this S. Ciprian calleth legitimam ordinationem, for lacke of which he denied Nouatian to be a Bishop, or to haue any authority, or power in the church. Herein neither you, nor your fellowes, who haue vnlawfully inuaded the administration of the sacraments, can make any iust, ad right answere I am sure.*

Marke well these demaunds, and the answere thervnto.

Lib. 1. epist. 6

Athanas. Apolog. 2.

VVhat, do ye not remember, what iudgment Athanasius, and the Bishops of Egipt, Thebais, Libia, and Pentapoli were of concerning Ischyrus the Arian? And why may not all good Catholique men iudge the like of you? Againe, what say you to Epiphanius, who writeth against one Zacheus of his time, for that being but a lay man, with wicked presumption tooke vpon him, to handle the holy misteries, and rashly to do the office of a Priest.

To these pressing and vrging demaunds, M. Iewell maketh a very sleight and sly answere, wherin though all that which he saith were true, yet it is farre short of the marke, which he should haue touched, but hath vtterly

vterlie falſe, as will appeare by D. Hardings reply, doth euidently ſhew his calling not to be iuſtifiable: his anſwere is this.

Iewell.

VVherat it farther pleaſeth you, to call for my letters of orders, and to demaund of me, as by ſome authority, whether I be Prieſt, or no? what handes were laid ouer me: and by what order I was made? I anſwere you, I am a Prieſt made long ſithence, by the ſame order and ordinaunce, and I thinke alſo by the ſame man, and the ſame hands, that you M. Harding were made Prieſt by, in the late time of that moſt vertuous Prince K. Edward the ſixth. Therfore ye cannot well doubt of my Prieſthood, without the doubting of your owne. Iewell defence of the Apologie pag. 129. printed 1611

Harding.

Doctor Harding hereunto replieth in this ſort. *Neither by the ſame ordinaunce M. Iewell, nor by the ſame man, nor by the ſame hands, nor in the time of the ſaid late king. Howbeit you tell not halfe my tale, I laid for my foundation out of S. Hierome theſe words:* Eccleſia non eſt, quæ non habet ſacerdotem: *Church is there none, which hath not a Prieſt, or Biſhop, and ſuch a Prieſt he there deſcribeth, as may conſecrate the ſacrament of the aulter, that is to ſay, that may offer externall ſacrifice, and ſuch a Biſhop he deſcribeth, who may order Prieſtes. For* ſacerdos *as you know doth ſignify both a Prieſt, and Biſhop. Now S. Hierome there diſputed againſt Hilarius a Deacon, who being alone in his new ſect, and not being able to offer ſacrifice, nor to make Prieſts, it behooued needs to leaue his congregation without Prieſt. I aske then aſwell of your Biſhoply vocation, and of your ſending, as of your Prieſthood. Giue me leaue, I pray you, here to put you in mind of my words once againe. Thus I ſaid, and yet you haue not anſwered me. Therfore to goe from your ſucceſſion which you cannot proue, and to come to your vocation* and ſo forth word by word, as is related before out of his firſt booke, called the confutation of Apology, and ther vnto addeth in the place laſt quoted. *Theſe being my queſtions M. Iewell, you anſwere, neither by what example handes were laid on you, nor who ſent you, but only you ſay, he made you Preiſt, that made me in king Edwards time. Verily I neuer had any name, or title of Prieſthood giuen to me, during the raigne of K. Edward: I only tooke the order of Deaconſhip,* Detection of ſundry foule errors &c. fol. 129. Detection fol. 130.

as it was then ministred, (whether I went not) So that if you haue no Preisthood, then I had in K. Edwards time, you are yet but a Deacon, and that also not after the Catholique manner, but in schismaticall sort. Truly after I had well considered with my selfe those questions, which in my confutation I moued vnto you, I tooke my selfe neither for Preist, nor yet for lawfull Deacon in all respects, by those orders which were taken in K. Edwards daies, being well assured that those, who tooke vpon them to giue orders, were altogether out of order themselues, and ministred them not, according to the rite, and manner of the Catholique church, as who had forsaken the whole succession of Bishops in all Christendome, and had erected a new congregation of their owne planting, the forme wherof was imagined only in their owne braines, and had not bene seene nor practised in the world before.

Note.

D. Harding hauing replied this, and much more vpon M. Iewells sleight answere to his former demaunds: how doth M. Iewell reioine vnto him thinke you? Marie with profound silence, deeply dissembling this whole replie, as though it had bene neuer written, albeit he would haue the world beleeue, that he hath fully answered in substance at least the whole booke, wherin these things are contained. Now whether the true reason of this dissembling silence be not the want of all probable meanes, to answere with satisfaction, let the discreete reader iudge. But seeing he is so mute in this point, let vs see, what he answereth to the rest of D. Hardings demaunds before related.

Iewell.

Iewell pag. 229. *He giueth chalke for cheese, because asked of his consecration, and he answereth of his election, and that with an heape of vntruthes. Harding detection fol. 232.*

Further, as if you were my Metropolitan, you demaund of me, whether I be a Bishop, or no? I answere you, I am a Bishop, and that by the free, accustomed, and canonicall election of the whole chapter of Salisbury, assembled solemnly together for that purpose, of which company you M. Harding were then one, and as I was informed, being present there in your owne person, amongst your brethren, gaue free and open consent vnto the election. If you deny this, take heede your owne breath blow not against you.

Harding.

It was no free election M. Iewell, when the chapter, which chose you, saw, that except it chose you, it selfe should be in danger of the Law, and of the Princes displeasure. It was no canonicall election, when

UMI

he was chosen, whom the old Canons haue iudged vnable for that vocation.

For how can he be chosen Bishop, that is to say high Priest, who teacheth that there is not at all any externall Priesthood in the church? how can he be chosen Bishop, that is to say high Priest, who teacheth with the old condemned heretique Aerius, that by Gods Law there is no difference between a Bishop, and a Priest? How can he be chosen lawfull Bishop in Salubury according to the old Canons, who teacheth all the old Canons to be superstitious, wherin from the Apostles time praiers for the dead were commaunded, and prescribed? what Canon can allow his election, who breaketh the vnity of the church, and deuideth himselfe and his flocke, from all their vnity and brotherhood, who made any Canons in any councell from the Apostles time till this day? Is he to be chosen canonically, who with Constantius the Arian, teacheth Bishops being the successours of the Apostles, to be at the placing, and remouing of Secular Officers, setting Cesar before Peter in Gods house, and earth before heauen? When were the Canons made, that allowed such an election? And yet you were made a Bishop by canonicall election forsooth. If the Canons were duly executed, they of that chapter ought rather to loose their voices, and otherwise to be punished, for that they were so dissolute, as to choose such a Prelate, who by the Canons is for many respects condemned. *Anathas. apoloq. 2.*

Was there euer any man more impudent, then you are M. Iewell? what would you doe if I were dead, sith you feare not to burthen me being yet aliue, with that thing which I neuer did, ne minded to doe? Of that chapter I was one at that time I confesse, as being then prebendary, and treasurer of that church, as yet I am in right. But of the company of them, that gaue their voices, and consented to the election of you M. Iewell, I was none. You were informed you say, that I was present, and gaue free and open consent vnto the election. Surely here you informe your reader of a false lie, as you haue of many moe. You were informed of the contrary. To be short I came not, ne was not made priuy, when they went about the pretensed election.

If my no be not sufficient against your yea, let the registers booke be vewed, for the triall betweene us both. For I trow, that booke (being neuer so great a falsifier otherwaies) you cannot well falsify. Let M. George Carew Chaunter of the same church, and Deane of the Queenes chappell, let M. Richard Chandler prebendary there, and Archdeacon of Sarubury, Let your owne friend, and fellowe M. Parry Chauncellour of that church be demaunded, whether I was present at your election, and gaue free, and open consent

vnto

vnto it, or no. You knew it, you knew it right well M. Iewell, that both I M. Dominicke, that reuerend and vertuous Priest, prebendary there (whom in your visitation for the Queenes highnes ye appointed to be a prisoner, as also my selfe in mine house at Salisbury) vttered, and with expresse words refused, to giue our voices and consent to your pretended election, Truly we counted it no lesse crime to haue chosen you Bishop of Sarisbury, then to haue chosen Arius, Eunomius, Nestorius, Eutiches, Aerius, Pelagius, or any other like heretique. Wherfore reuoke so many vntruthes, as you haue here vttered with your breath, your election was neither free, nor canonicall, the whole chapter was not present, I was not one of that company, I gaue not my consent. Now that you haue so impudently affirmed all this, notwithstanding take heede (that I may vse your owne words) your owne breath blow not against you.

To all this M. Iewell answereth with silence as before, hauing nothing to reply with shew of truth: but to the rest of D. Hardings demaunds he answereth in this sort.

Iewell.

Pag. 129. *As for the impertinent tales of Ischyras and Zacchæus, they touch vs nothing: they were none of ours: we know them not: our Bishops are made in forme and order, as they haue bene euer by free election of the chapter: by consecration of the Archbishops, and other three Bishops, and by the admission of the Prince.*

Harding.

Detection fol. 234. *These true histories, not tales M. Iewell touch you in this behalfe; because Priests are not so consecrated with you, that they may stand to offer the sacrifice of the aultar, as it was reported of Ischyras, that he had done.*

Moreouer Epiphanius writeth of Zacchæus, Iudentèr Sancta mysteria contrectabat, & sacrificia cum laicus esset, impudentèr tractabat. *He lewdly handled the holy misteries, and whereas he was a lay man, he impudently handled the sacrifices. What sacrifices (I pray you) hath your religion, which a lay man may not handle, as well as a Priest? But because you haue abandoned all externall sacrifice, and Priesthood, therfore you iudge, the example of Zacchæus belongeth nothing vnto you. Certainlie by these examples it is prooued, that ye are no Bishops, and so farre they be not impertinent.*

Your Bishops are made (you say) [in forme and order] what forme and order meane you? meane you the old, which was vsed

fyue hundreth yeares, or the new? In the old forme after the election, notice was giuen to the Bishop of Rome, and to all the Bishops of the church, that such a man was lawfully chosen Bishop within the church, and not schismatically; and so all the other Bishops knew by the communicatory letters, to whom they should send, or of whom they should receiue such letters. But so ye were not made Bishops: If ye were, shew vs to what Bishops out of England ye wrote any such letters. After that, the custome of those letters became to be out of vse, the only Bishop of Rome his confirmation was in steede of the said notice; and by him surely you were not confirmed: And yet seeing he is a Bishop, if you will not graunt him the confirmation, ye ought at the least to put him to knowledge of your election, that he may know you to be men, with whom he may communicate. But for as much as you wrote not to him in that matter, you shew that ye be no Catholique Bishops. For neuer was there any Catholique Bishop in the church, which did not one way, or other, shew himselfe to communicate with S. Peters successour, from the beginning till this day.

But ye were made, you say, by the consecration of the Archbishops, and other three Bishops. And how I pray was your Archbishops himself consecrated? what three Bishops in the Realme were there to lay handes vpon him? you haue now vttered a worse case for your selues, then was by me before named. For your Metropolitane, who should giue authority to all your consecrations, himself had no lawfull consecration. If you had bene consecrated after the forme, and order which hath euer bene vsed, ye might haue had Bishops out of Fraunce, to haue consecrated you, in case there had lacked in England. But now there were sufficient Bishops enough in England, who either were not required, or refused to consecrate you, which is an euident signe, that ye sought not such a consecration, as had bene euer vsed, but such an one, whereof all the former Bishops were ashamed. M. Parker not cõsecrated.

15. All this sharpe reply affirming so directly M. Parker not to haue beene consecrated, wherby the consecrations of all the rest are necessarily prooued to be none, M. Iewell (finding nothing to answere therevnto) dissembleth, as he doth the former, excepting these words only. *In the old forme after the election, notice was giuen to the Bishop of Rome, and to all the Bishops in the church, that such a man was lawfully chosen in the church, and not schismatically &c. But so ye were not made Bishops. If ye were shew vs, to what Bishops out of England ye wrote any such letters.* Wherunto though his answere be as impertinent, as his dissembling the

reſt is euident: yet becauſe it pertaineth not much to our purpoſe ſpeaking here of conſecration onlie, and not of those things, which goe before, or follow the ſame, I will not aske ſo farre (good reader) thy patience, as to ſtand either to reade, or relate it, but will in briefe giue thee to vnderſtand, the twofold reaſon, for which I haue ſet downe here at large this diſpute betwixt M. Iewell, and M. Harding.

Firſt, that the heedfull reader, be he Catholique, or Proteſt may clearelie ſee, how M. Iewell himſelf, (the cheeftaine of all our new maiſters in England, and haueing part in the matter beingone of the Bishops about whoſe conſecration the controuerſie is, and therfore knew well how it was performed, and neither wanting witt, nor will to maintaine it, if it had bene to be maintained) is by ſtrength of argument forced to yeeld the bucklers to his aduerſarie, and to confeſſe the nullitie of his owne and his fellowes conſecration, not by expreſſe acknowledgment of the truth, for that his hereticall pride, and obſtinate errour would not permit him to do, but by his deepe diſſembling of his aduerſaries arguments, whervnto becauſe he could not anſwere, he let them paſſe in ſilence, as if they had not bene obiected againſt him at all, And this is ſpeciallie to be obſerued, in the obiection of M. Parkers conſecration, whervpon the conſecrations of all the reſt do neceſſarilie depend, whom doubtles he either knew, not to be conſecrated at all (vnles it were done at the nagges head, after the manner that is and hath hitherto bene verie crediblie reported) or els in ſuch other ſort as being ſpecified would haue giuen his aduerſaries (whom he knew was not altogether ignorant how that matter paſſed) greater aduantage againſt him. For thou maiſt be well aſſured (good reader) that M. Iewell vndertaking to anſwere this booke of D. Hardings, if he could haue shaped but any ſhifting anſwere, to thoſe preſſing points of his owne, and his fellowes calling M. Harding ſhould haue heard from him on both eares. Iudge thou therfore of what credit M. Maſons records are, ſeeing that M. Iewell who was Bishop himſelf, and (without doing M. Maſon anie iote of wrong) better able to haue maintained his calling, and conſecration then he, and being vrged vnto it in ſuch ſort, as we haue ſeene, is driuen into ſuch an abſolute non plus about thoſame, that he hath not

wise word to saie in his owne iustification. Surelie it must needs be, that either these records were not then coined, or if they were, yet were they of small force, for the iustification of the new manner of ordination. For no man of ordinarie sense can thinke, that either M. Iewell knew them not at all, or knowing them did not vnderstand, of what force they were, for the iustifying of his owne calling, supposing they were of anie at all.

Secondlie, I haue related this dispute at large, that the reader, who hath not the meanes to reade Harding, in his owne bookes, but onelie as M. Iewell relateth his words, may see, how easilie he may be deceiued therin. For as in this particuler point, so in all others he leaueth out that, which doth most presse, and relateth onlie those things, whervnto he thinketh he may make some such shusling answere, that he may be by the more ignorant sort esteemed, to haue satisfied his aduersarie. And this I would all men, that reade him, should take notice of, whether they be Protestants, or otherwaies: For hardlie shall a mā find a more colouring, and lesse solide or substantiall aduersarie of Catholique religion, then is M. Iewell, being read with attention.

16. And to conclude this chapter it is farther to be obserued, that not D. Harding onlie, but all or most of the Catholique writers of our owne countrie (to saie nothing of strangers) hauing in expresse words, obiected to the new superintendents, intruded into Bishopricks in the beginning of Q. Elizabeths raigne, the nullitie of their calling, and consecration, did neuer by any either of themselues, who should best haue knowne thē records, or by anie other in their behalfe, heare of anie such records, or registers, M. Mason now after 50. yeares would obtrude vpon vs, as authenticall testimonies of their Canonicall consecration. What therfore can any man of indifferent iudgment thinke in this case, but that either these records, which M. Mason now produceth, were not then extant, or if they were, that they are not such as can make any probable, much lesse authenticall proofe of these mens Canonicall consecration. For if they had bene in those daies, and also were such, as might haue made sufficient proofe of the matter in question, how is it possible, that they should not be produced

From the page 116. to the page 142.

before now? the parties themselues, whom it specially behoued to make proofe of their owne Canonicall calling being so often, and earnestlie vrged therevnto by their aduersaries, triumphing ouer them for want of due proofe thereof.

Pag. 8. M. Mason relateth some of the sayings of our Catholique writers, that obiect the nullity of the English new ministery, which I will here set downe, and add one or two more vnto them; that the reader may therby iudge, how vnprobable it is, that M. Masons new found records should beare any creditt for the proofe of that, for which he produceth them.

Motiue 21. *Consider* (saith D. Bristow) *what church that is, whose ministers are but very lay men, vnsent, vncalled, vnconsecrated, holding therfore amongst vs, when they repent and returne, no other place but of lay men, in no case admitted, no not looking to minister in any office, vnles they take orders, which before they had not?*

De Schismate lib. 3. pag. 299. D. Sanders: *The new clergy in England is composed partly of olde Apostates, partly of mere lay-men.* And in the dedication of his rocke of the church, he stilleth *M. Parker*, to whom he dedicateth that booke, no otherwaies then *M. D. Parker bearing the name of Archbishop of Canterbury.*

Reason 7. M. Howelt: *that either all, or the most part of the ministers in England, be merely Laymen, and no priests, and consequently haue no authority in these things it is euident.*

Rhems testament Rom. 10.15. *All your new Euangelists, which haue intruded themselues into church and pulpit, be euery one from the highest to the lowest false prophets, running and vsurping, being neuer lawfully called.*

Note that M. Fulke, who was ignorant of nothing in this point, that M. Mason can know, answering both Bristowes Motiues, and the notes vpon the new testament, to satisfie their obiections of want of calling in the new ministery, denieth ordinary calling to be alwaies necessary, which desperate shift he would neuer haue vsed, if he had bene prouided of so easie, and sufficient an answere, as M. Masons records would haue afforded him, if they had bene authenticall, and without flawe.

Caluino turcis. lib. 4. cap. 15. M. Reinolds: *there is no heardman in all Turkie, which doth not vndertake the gouernement of his beard vpon better reason, and greater*

order, and authority, then these your magnificent Apostles, and Euangelists can shew, for this deuine and high office of gouerning soules, reforming churches &c.

D. Stapleton in his counterblast printed welneere fifty yeares agoe, against M. Horne, thē vsurping the Bishops see of Winchester hath these vrging speeches. *To say truly you are no lord Winchester not elswhere, but only M. Robert Horne. Is (a) it not notorious, that ye and your Collegues were not ordained according to the prescripe, I will not say of the church, but euen of the very statutes? How then can you chalenge to your self, the name of the lord Bishop of Winchester?* Counterblast fol. 7. a Ibid. fol. 9.

You are without any consecration at all of your metropolitane, himself poore man being no Bishop neither. Fol. 301.

These speeches (which are no where answered) I do not relate, for that I intend to conclude any other thing out of them, then that in the iudgment of any sensible person, it cannot be probable, that when these things were written, there were extant any such records, as being produced might make any thing for the iustification of our new superintendentes Canonicall consecration. For if there had bene any such, doubtles they could not haue bene vnknowne to M. Parker, who should haue bene the author of them, as bearing the name of metropolitane; not to M. Horne, and M. Iewell (to omit the rest) who should haue subscribed thervnto, as the parties whose consecrations were recorded: and being not vnknowne, there is lesse probability, that they should be so concealed by them, that notwithstanding the nullity of consecration, so oftē obiected against thē, by their Catholike aduersaries, they should not once mention hem.

It is also to be obserued that M. Masōs registers disagree with those that M. Goodwin vsed in his catalogue of Bishops some time in the day, some time in the moneth, and some time in the yeare, as is manifest in the cōsecratiōs of Doynet, Ridley, Couerdall, Grindall, Horne, Gueast, Piers: Which necessarily prooueth falsity in the one at least, with suspition of forgery in both.

Againe M. Mason, M. Sutcliffe, and M. Butler, all speaking of M. Parkers consecration do all differ one from another in naming his cōsecrators. For M. Mason saith it was done by Barlow, Scorie, Couerdall and Hodgekins. M. Sutcliffe saith besides

Pag. 127. Sute: against kell: pag. 5. But: defence of their mission.

the tree first named by M. Mason *there were two suffragans as the [illegible] of consecration yet to be seene* (saith he) *mentioneth.* M. Butler saith the suffragan of Douer was one of the consecrators, who notwithstanding is not so much as named in the Queenes patēts, wherby commission was giuen to the named therin to consecrate M. Parker. So that these men seeme to haue had three diuers and disagreeing registers of one and the same actiō and therfore the credit of euery one of them is made at least doubtfull.

The fourteenth Chapter.

That M. Parker bearing some time the name of Archbishops of Canterburie, was not true and lawfull Bishops.

1. ALl the defects, and inhabilities either of heresie, or want of true consecration, which in the precedent chapters are shewed to haue bene in Cranmer, and the Bishops aswell of K Edwards as Q. Elizabeth time, being without all cōtrouersie in M. Parker, it shall not be needfull to say anie more of them; yet because the succession of the present English ministery is deriued from him, as from the fountaine, I thinke it not amisse, to note some particuler circumstances of his consecration, which to anie indifferent iudgment may shew the nullity therof, and consequētly of all those that are deriued from it. For the fountaine being infected, the streames, that flowe from it, vnles they be purged, must necessarily be impure and noisome.

These circumstances, which I intend to note, are for the most part taken out of M. Masons owne relations, and therfore must needs be free, from all suspition of sinister, or partiall dealing in me.

Pag. 131. First therfore M. Mason relateth out of the life of M. Parker this *Singuler priuiledge, or (as it is tearmed) felicity that being the 70. Archbishop after Augustin, yet of all that number he was the only man, [illegible] first of all that receiued consecration without the Popes bulls, and [illegible] Aaronicall ornaments, as Gloues, Rings, Sandals, Slippers, Miter, [illegible] such like trifles, making an happie beginning (more rightly, and more [illegible]*

to the simplicity, and purity of the Ghospell) with prayer, inuocation of the holy Ghost, imposition of hands, and religious promises.

Marke that the Protestāt ministry begāne in M. Parker, and therfore was not afore.

What in anie sober iudgment can he said more directly, for the reproofe and disallowance of any mans ordination? M. Parker is confessed to be the first man of threescore and ten, that descending, and succeding one to another in the see of Canterburie, for the space almost of a thousand yeares, *that was consecrated without the Popes bulls &c.* Who therfore would not say, that he was the first man that was intruded into that see without all order, or Canonicall consecration? He is also confessed to be the first, that began the new order of consecration, who can therfore doubt, but that his consecration is not of Christs institution, descending vnto him by succession from the Apostles, but a new inuention of man neuer heard of before?

If M. Parker were not consecrated Archbishop, after the same manner that S. Austin was, who brought vnto our nation, now a thousand yeares agoe the doctrine of Christ (as cōfessedly he was not) what man of sense and reason will say, that his consecration is good, and canonicall?

Surely there is no more reason to say this, then to say that he should be rightly Baptized, that should receiue another manner of baptisme, then that which S. Augustin brought vnto vs, and practized. If therfore we retaine the baptisme which he brought vnto vs, as the only true baptisme instituted by Christ, and preached by his Apostles through the whole world, why should not we also retaine the orders, and manner of consecration of priests, and Bishops taught by him?

Who hath eies and seeth not, that to reiect the one, is but a step to cast the other away also, and so by certaine degrees to returne to our former paganisme, from which God conuerted vs, by the ministery, and cooperation of that holie man, and seruant of his S. Augustine.

Harrison in his description of Britannie, Ascha, Bale, and others haue the like.

2. I know that some haue bene so furious and frantique, as to write that S. Augustin, in steed of conuerting vs from Paganisme to Christianity, brought vs from one superstition to another. But these men being possessed with his Spirit, that enuieth our conuersion, and therfore would draw vs backe to our former errours, and infidelity, speake not but as they haue learned

learned of him; who, if they could be heard in this point, would quicklie say as much of the Apostles, yea and of our Saviour Christ himselfe. For that is the end aimed at by them, or at least by their maister, which because he is out of all hope to bring men vnto at the first iumpe, he laboureth to win them vnto it by degrees. And surely he hath much preuailed already in his purpose, seeing he hath found such instruments, as dare preach that he that conuerted vs first to Christ, brought vs into errour: oh senseles wretches!

Page 131. M. Mason saith: *that M. Parker with the rest was made Bishop with imposition of hands, which is the only ceremony of ordination mentioned in the scripture: and which Bellarmine thinketh to be the matter essential. And for other ceremonies which are but inuentions of man, they cannot be inforced vpon vs, Farther then the wisdome of our church hold it conuenient.*

Acts 13. 3. It is false that the scripture mentioneth only imposition of hands in ordination: for it mentioneth also both fasting and praier; which are thone or both out of vse with our new ministery. Neither is the imposition of hands mentioned in the scripture, a bare laying on of hands, without an expresse forme of words, as is before shewed out of S. Ambrose saying, that

Vpon the actes, Cap. 13. *imposition of hands is mysticall wordes, wherwith the elect is confirmed to the worke, receiuing authority (his conscience bearing witnes) that he may be bold in our lords steed to offer sacrifice to God.* But in the new forme of ordination there is no such words vsed, as may giue authority to the ordained, to exercise any power of order. For these words *Receiue thou the holy ghost*, which they only vse, are not such as is before shewed.

And although Bellarmine say, that imposition of hands pertaineth to the essentiall matter of ordination, yet others doubt therof, (as is before mentioned out of M. Mason himselfe) in whose opinion (which cannot be denied but to be probable) our new ministery must needs want all essentiall matter of ordination: But be it true, that imposition of hands pertaineth to the essentiall matter of ordination, as Bellarmine thinketh, and that most probably, yet doth neither he, nor any other Catholique author one escepted say, that it is the only or whole essentiall matter of ordination, yea he teached expresly the contrary, in the place cited by M. Mason, and therfore his doctrine

De Sacram. ordinis Ca. 9. seruеth

serueth nothing at all, for the iustification of M. Parkers ordination by sole imposition of hands.

And albeit the Catholique church doth not commaund (as necessary to the Sacrament) any ceremonies not pertaining to the substance of holy order, yet doth she iustly condemne the rashnes, and presumption of those, that of sett purpose, or contempt do omitt in ordination, any of those holy rites, which she hath receiued from her first Pastors, and hath religiously conserued vnto our daies, commaunding vs to vse the same: And Farther because amongst diuers words, and actions which she hath alwaies vsed in ordination, it is not declared in which of them precisely, the substance, or essence of holy order consisteth, especially that of Episcopall order, therfore doth she vpon good reason, reiect that ordination as none at all; wherin are omitted either all, or the greatest part of those solemne words, and actions, which are knowne to haue euer bene vsed, of which kind it is euident, and confessed here, M. Parkers ordination to haue bene. And therfore it is a notorious vntruth, *that it was performed in such forme, as is required by the ancient Canons*, as M. Mason affirmeth, vnles by ancient Canons he vnderstand the statutes, made of this matter in Edward the sixt his daies. *Pag. 121.*

4. Secondly I gather out of M. Mason, that of the foure consecrators of M. Parker, there was neuer one of them true Bishop, vnles peraduenture it were Hodgekins the suffragan of Bedford: who (suppose he was truly consecrated himselfe, which is not certaine) yet could he not (euen in M. Masons doctrin) consecrate thother, being only assistent in that action, and not he that did consecrate, which (as M. Mason saith) was done by Barlow; who was neuer consecrated Bishop himselfe, as appeareth by that his consecration is no where registred, and therfore is he no more to be numbred in the ranke of Bishops, then they were in the number of priests, who could not find themselues recorded in their linage.

Two Bb. present the party to be [illegible] cra[illegible] th[illegible] bo[illegible] for [illegible] nounc[illegible] blessing as principall cōsecrator.

M. Mason bringeth diuers coniectures of M. Barlowes consecration, but not one haft proofe. *He discharged* (saith he) *all things belonging to the order of a Bishop, euen Episcopall consecration: therfo-* *Saith M. Mason pa. 39. Page 127. Esdra. 2. cap. 7. 64.*

re doubtles was he consecrated. But by the like forme of arg might he be prooued to haue beene a lawfull husband, because he had a Woman, and diuers children. Which kind of proofe how current soeuer it may be in M. Masons logicke, yet in it self it is ridiculous, as euidently supposing that for a truth, which is in question, and therby begging that which he should prooue. For vnles he first suppose, that M Barlow was consecrated himselfe, which is the thing in question, to say that he did helpe to consecrate others, doth prooue nothing, vnles he could farther prooue, or that it were graunted him, that M. Barlow neuer did any thing in that kind, but that he might lawfully doe, which I suppose M. Mason will not easilie vndertake to prooue.

Secondly, *he was* (saith he) *generally acknowledged, and obeied as a Bishop*. So I thinke he will not denie, but. Ridley, Hooper, Farrer, and the rest of their creation were, during the time they held the roomes of Bishops, and yet were they iudged, both by the Spirituall, and temporall court, as we haue seene before, not to haue bene consecrated, therfore this argument prooueth nothing to the purpose but a popular errour, grounded vpon the vniust possession of a Bishopricke. And much lesse doth that prooue any thing, which he addeth, saying *that Bucanan called him Bishop of S. Davids*. For it is no straunge thing, that he that hath a Bishopricke, should be called Bishop especially by a stranger, to whose testimony M. Mason recurring in this matter, doth shew that he is hard sett for proofes.

These are M. Masons coniectures of M. Barlowes consecration, which, if the case should be brought into any indifferent court, would not I dare say suffice to prooue his consecration. For seing that no simple priest cā be beleeued, that he is a Priest, without the letters of his ordination (especially where there is doubt of his priesthood) much lesse ought a Bishop to be beleeued to be a Bishop, without authenticall records of his ordination.

And is there not therfore in all Bishops, and Archbishops sees, an office of register, where all the ordinations are recorded, to the end that euery one truly ordained may haue at all times authenticall *testes*, of his orders receiued? So that vnles

vnleſſe the records perish by fire, or other extraordinary accident (which cannot be ſaid in M. Barlowes caſe) no man can faile of proofe of his orders, which in Bishops is by ſo much more certaine, by how much more diligence there is vſed therin, by reaſon of the great inconuenience which would enſue, if any ſuch default should happen. Seeing therfore the records of M. Barlowes conſecration do not appeare, (in ſo much that M. Maſon is forced to proque it by coniecture, as we haue ſeene: Wheras he citeth the regiſters of the conſecrations of all therest but his) nor yet haue miſcaried by any extraordinary accident happening to the metropolitanes regiſters, how can he be iudged to haue bene truly conſecrated? Eſpecially ſeeing (as M. Maſon ſaith) the regiſters of Cranmer beare record of his (I meane M. Barlowes) preferment to the priory of Bishame, of his election to the Bishopricke of S. Aſaph, and of the confirmation of the ſame; how is it therfore poſſible, that his conſecration (if euer it had bene) should not be found likewiſe recorded? *Pag.* 127.

Farther if M. Barlow had bene truly conſecrated, and conſequently a true Bishop, he should not doubtles haue bene put after Antony Kitchin Bishop of Landaffe, in the Queenes letters directed vnto them, and the reſt for conſecration of M. Parker, of which letters M. Maſon repeateth a peece (ſaying that they are not only recorded in the regiſters of M. Parker, but in the chauncery it ſelfe) in theſe words. *Elizabeth Dei gratia &c. Reuerendis in Chriſto patribus, Anthonio Landauenſi. Will? Barlowe quondam Bath: nunc Ciceſtrenſi electo, Ioh: Scory &c.* Wheras Barlow if he had bene conſecrated Bishop, should haue bene firſt in the ranke, as being moſt auncient by 4. yeares at the leaſt, as is euident by M. Maſons owne Chronology, putting Arth: Buckley his conſecration (wherat he ſaith aſſiſted as Bishop M. Barlow) an: 1541. and Anth. Kitchins conſecration an. 1545. For it is euident that thoſe Bishops, who haue not precedency by reaſon of their ſees (as none haue in England, excepting the two Archbishops, and two or three more wherof Landaffe is none) haue their place and ranke, according to their antiquity in conſecration, which is alwaies neceſſarily obſerued in ſuch publique and ſolemne acts (as is the conſecration of an Archbishop) *Pag.* 126.

for auoiding of scandall, which should necessarily follow, by inuercing and confounding of mens rankes and places. And doubtles if M. Barlow had knowne himselfe as truly a Bishop, as he esteemed M. Kitchin to be, he would haue disdained to haue bene his second in that honorable action, seeing he should haue bene so much his senior Bishop, if he had bene Bishop indeede.

And what I pray you was the reason, that M. Kitchin Bishop of Landaffe hauing that honorable place assigned him, in that action by the Queenes patents, to be the consecrator of the new Archbishop, thaugh he was Iunior Bishop to M. Barlow by foure yeares as is already noted, was not for all that one of the cõsecrators, seeing he was present? Marie because he would not commit such a sacriledge; nor incurr the censures belõging therevnto though (fearing the Queenes and councells indignation) he pretended darknes of sight to be the reason: vpon his refusall (which was not expected) they were forced to haue recourse to others, who made no scruple of any thing. But because this particuler toucheth directly the matter in question, I will heere set downe how the whole action of the consecration of all the first Bishops made in the beginning of Q. Elizabeths raigne (wherof M. Parker was one) passed, by the relation of such as were present therat. At the nagges head in Cheapside by accorded appointment mett all those that were nominated to Bishoprickes vacant either by death, as was that of Canterbury only, or by vniust deposition, as were all the rest: their names are set downe in the chapter following. Thither came also the old Bishop of Landaffe to make them Bishops, which thing being knowne to D. Bonner Bishop of London then prisoner, he sent vnto the Bishop of Landaffe, forbidding him vnder paine of excõmunication to exercise any such power within his Dioceese, as to order those men, wherwith the old Bishop being terrified, and otherwise also moued in his owne conscience refused to proceede in that action, alleadging chiefly for reason of his forbearance his want of sight as is before said: which excuse they interpreting to be but an euasion were much mooued against the poore old mã, and wheras hitherto they had vsed him with all curtesie and respect, they then turned their copy, reuiling and calling him doating foole, and the like some of them

them saying. *This old foole thinketh we cannot be Bishops vnles we be greased*, to the disgrace as well of him, as of the Catholique manner of episcopall consecration. Being notwithstãding thus deceiued of their expectatiõ, and hauing no other meane to come to their desire, they resolued to vse M. Scories helpe, who hauing borne the name of Bishop in king Edwards time, was thoughto haue sufficient power to performe that office, especially in such a streate necessity. He hauing cast of together with his religious habite (for he had bene a religious man) all scruple of conscience willingly went about the matter, which he performed in this sort, hauing the Bible in his hand, and they all kneeling before him, he laid it vpon euery one of their heads or shoulders saying, *Take thou authority to preach the word of God sincerely*. And so they rose vp Bishops.

This whole narration without adding or detracting any word pertaining to the substance of the matter, I haue heard oftener then once of M. Thomas Bluet a graue, learned, and iudicious priest. He hauing receiued it of M. Neale a man of good sort and reputation, sometimes reader of the Hebrew or Greeke Lecture (I remember not whether) in Oxford: But when this matter passed, was belonging to Bishop Bonner, and sent by him to deliuer the message before mentioned to the Bishop of Landaffe, and withall to attend there to see the end of the busines. Againe M. Bluet had other good meanes to be informed of this matter being long time prisoner together with D. Watson Bishop of Lincolne, and diuers other men of marke of the aunciẽt cleargy, in whose time and in whose sight, as a man may say, this matter was done. Of this narration there are (I thieke) as many witnesses yet liuing as there are priests remaining aliue, that haue bene prisoners together with M. Bluet in Wisbich castle, where I also heard it of him.

M. Mason in the appendix to his booke hauing related this same thing out of Sacro Bosco (who had heard it from the same partie for he was also prisoner sometime in Wisbich castle) for answere saith. *No man of Mason can imagine that they would goe to consecrate one another in a taverne, and so incurre the daunger of the law, after they had according to their hares desire an Archbishop of their owne religion, quietly possessed of his church and chaire.*

What law doth he meane that they should haue incurred daunger of.

But this is nothing to the purpose. For he supposeth M. Parker

ker to haue bene consecrated, and already installed in his church and chaire before this solemne meeting at the nagges head, wheras the obiection wherunto he answereth saith the contrarie, and includeth M. Parker with the rest, as one of the number to be consecrated there, and therfore is his answere very friuolous. Peraduenture he thinketh that he that alreadie prooued M. Parkers consecration so fully by producing the registers, that it cannot be denied, and therfore supposeth it in this his answere as cleare. But seeing his registers are found so full of crakes and flawes, that they neede to be made good by other proofes then yet appeare, they cannot in any indifferent mans iudgment be holden for good proofes of that which is here in question; when he saith, *that they hauing quiet possession of churches it cannot be probable that they would goe to a tauerne to be consecrated*: he speaketh with more shew of reason then in any thing he hath said of this matter in his whole booke before, and yet this is also easily and truly answered, for it is not said that they went to the tauerne to be consecrated, because they had not the liberty of churches, but the reason was because they being out of all hope or expectation to draw the old Bishop of Landaffe (by whom they thought they should be consecrated) to their church with them, they made no difficultie or scruple to resort to such a place, as he would be content to come vnto, and so it came to passe that their meering was at the nags head, as is said before.

Not only Catholiques, who by our aduersaries may be suspected of partialitie, are witnesses in this matter, but Iohn Stow a Protestant hath testified the same, not in writing, for that he durst not, though he had diligentlie sought out all particulers therof, but in words to some persons that are yet liuing, and of most entire credit and fidelitie, who notwithstanding being no lesse fearefull to witnes this of him though now dead, then he himselfe was to write it being aliue, cannot here be named. But that this is true I can giue this most probable argument, if it be no more then probable, Stow in his Chronicle maketh no more mention of the consecration of these new prelates, or any thing belonging therunto, then if there neuer had bene any such matter, no not so much as of M. Parkers consecration or enstalling, which silence, all circumstances con-

red, could not proceed from any other reason, then from feare of offending by saying the truth. For first it is evident that he is carefull to set downe all occurrents worthy of any memorie, (especially happening about London) though of farre lesse moment then this. Secondlie he professeth speciall loue, and respect to M. Parker, and therfore setteth downe many particulers of him, of much lesse moment, then is his consecration or enstalling. Thirdly not only he, but all other Chronographers take diligent care not to omit any innouation, or change of old customes or fashions into new, especiallie in a matter of such moment as this is. Fourthlie he setteth downe the consecration, enstalling receiuing the pall, yea and the first masse of Cardinall Pole, M. Parkers immediate predecessour. All which were but ordinarie occurrents in other Archbishops, much lesse therfore could he forget to set downe the consecration of M. Parker, which was so new and extraordinarie, as M. Mason himselfe saith, it was singuler and vnlike to all those that went before since S. Austin the first Archbishop of that see, and might as truly haue said since Christ his time.

Fiftly, besides many other things pertaining to the change of religion, set downe by him in that yeare 1559. of farre lesse consideration then is the institutiō of a new clergie he putteth downe the depriuation (so he calleth it) of the old bishops in the moneth of Iuly, which could not permit him to forget the creation of the new ones, especiallie he hauing ioined together before in Q. Maries time, the restitution of Bishop Bonner, and the rest of the Catholique Bishops displaced by K. Edward, and the remouing of the others intruded in their place, some reason therfore must there necessarille be of his affected silence in this particuler. Pag. 1036.

Sixthly speaking of Hēry the 2. King of Frāce his obsequies solēnized in Paules this same yeare 1559. saith, that the 9. of Septēber (to wit three monethes and more before M. Parkers consecration according to M. Masons registers) *was a sermon preached by D. Scory, in place of D. Grindall Bishop of London.* Now seeing he calleth him Bishop absolutelie without adding of elect or other like restriction, it seemeth that he had then some consecration; which could not be that which M. Masons registers speake of, for Pag. 1083.

for this was three moneths after and more as is already noted, and therfore most like to be that at the nags head. I see well that Stow some lines before calleth D. Parker Archbishop of Canterburie elect. But this taketh not away the difficultie. For he might for all that be consecrated Bishop as well as D. Barlow, whom he calleth in the same place Bishop of Chichester elect, and D. Scory whom he calleth Bishop of Hereford elect, which two notwithstading are supposed to haue bene cōsecrated long before that time. And surely if D. Parker had not bene cōsecrated at least after their māner, he could not haue had place in that solemne action of the Kings obsequies, before D. Barlow and D. Scory if they were consecrated, as they are supposed by M. Mason to haue bene. For Archbishops only elect cannot haue place before consecrated Bishops in the offices of the church.

M. Mason will not haue priests thaugh cardinals to sit before Bishops pag. 27. much lesse therfore priests nominated only Archbishops.

Therfore when Stow calleth him Archbishop of Canterbury elect, he doubtles speaketh in the same sense of him, that he doth when he calleth D. Barlow Bishop of Chichester elect, and D. Scory Bishop of Hereford elect, which he doth not because they were not consecrated Bishops after their manner, but because they were not as yet enstalled in those sees, as D. Parker also was not as yet in that of Canterburie. And that this is true, it appeareth by the different stile he giueth to D. Parker and D. Grindall, tearming thone absolutely Bishop of London without all restriction, because he was already enstalled and in possession of his Brishopricke, and thother only Archbishop elect for want of the same circumstance. If therfore D. Parker and D. Grindall were Bishops in the moneth of September the yeare 1559. as by the testimonie of Stow they appeare to haue bene, what verity can there be in M. Masons regisiters, that make M. Parker to be consecrated only the 17. of December in the same yeare, and D. Grindall after him.

Sanders de schismate lib. 3.

It is also to be vnderstood, that at the same time, when there was question of consecrating these new Bishops, there was prisoner in the tower of London an Archbishop of Ireland, who was offered his libertie and diuers other rewards, if he would haue consecrated the newly elected Bishops, which doubtles argueth the want of others, that were (euen by themselues) esteemed true Bishops, for if such had bene at hand, they would not haue recurred to him, with daunger to receiue a

disgraceful

diſgracefull deniall as they did. But now I will returne to my former purpoſe.

6. The reſt of M. Parkers conſecrators, according to M. Maſons accoumpt to wit M. Scory and M Couerdall were of the new conſecration, deuiſed in K. Edward the 6. his time, and therfore found euen by the iudges of the Realme, to be no Bishops, as is before shewed. And is euidentlie prooued out of M. Maſons owne records and teſtimonies. For they were conſecrated, as M. Maſon ſaith the 30. of Auguſt 1551. to wit fiue moneths before the new forme of conſecrations was ſe forth or allowed, which was done in the parlement holden the 5. and 6. yeare of Edward the 6. as appeareth both by the ſtatute it ſelfe, which is the firſt of that parlement, as alſo by the firſt ſtatute of the 8. of Elizabeth: but this parlement of the 5. and 6. of Edw. the 6. began the 13. of Ianuarie 1551. that is foure moneths and more after the conſecration of Scorie and Couerdall. For by the coumpt of England the yeare beginneth in March, and not in Ianuarie as all men know. Euident therfore it is that they could not be conſecrated by the new forme: and no leſſe euident it is, that they were not conſecrated by the old forme; for that (as M. Maſon confeſſeth) was abrogated in the parlement of the third and fourth of Ed. the 6. and appeareth alſo by the 12. ſtatute of that parlement. Soe that it is cleare that theſe two conſecrators of M. Parker were neuer conſecrated at all neither by one forme or other. And therfore had there bene none other defect in M. Parkers conſecration (as diuers others haue bene already prooued) but only this, that his conſecrators were not conſecrated, and therfore no true Bishops, it is more then ſufficient to prooue his want of conſecration, and conſequently his want of all true calling. Pag. 93. Pag. 94.

Notwithſtanding all which ſo blind is M. Maſon, either through his affection to new falshood, or hatred to auncient truth, that he blusheth not to write in this ſort. *Thus haue we examined the place, the perſons, the matter, the forme of his* (M. Parker) *conſecration, and find nothing but agreable to the lawes of the land, the Canons of the church, and the practice of reuerend antiquity.* Do not thinke (good Reader) that I exceeded in ſaying, that M. Maſon was blinded by affection when he wrote theſe words for he himſelf

doth euidently proque it, not seeing what he wrote, but only ten or twelue lines before in these words. *This was hu singuller felicity, that being the 70. Archbushop after Austin yet was the first of all, which receiued consecration without the Popes buls &c.* For if he were the first, that was consecrated in this manner, how doth his consecration agree, either with the lawes of the land which were extant before this new manner of consecration was deuised many ages; and much lesse is it agreeable with the Canons of the church, and venerable antiquitie? Wherfore to make this speach of his agree aswell with that, which he said before, as also with the truth it selfe, he must wipe out this litle word (*but*) and so shall his saying be most true in it selfe, and conformable to his former words. Yet doth he shew himself more senseles in that which followeth, adding; *wherin how circumspectly the Queene proceeded, may further appeare by this, that her letters patents were sent to diuers learned professors of the law, that they might freely giue their iudgmẽt, and all of them iointly confessed, that both the Queenes maiesty might lawfully authorize, the persons to the effect specified* (which was to consecrate M. Parker) *and the said persons also might lawfully exercise the act of confirming, and consecrating in the same to them committed: whose names subscribed with their owne hands remaine in record, as followeth. VVilliam May, Robert weston, Edward Leeds. Henry Haruy. Thomas Yale. Nicolas Bullingha.*

Ex Regiſtro Math. Parker fol. 3.

Is not this beyond measure ridiculous? For, suppose that these men had bene as great diuines as S Augustin: as absolute lawiers as Barthold, as constant and vncorrupt as Curius Dentatus, and withall, not subiect: to her that demaunded their resolution, and therby more like ad to deliuer their opinions with indifferencie. of what moment should their iudgment be, in comparison of that of the whole Christian world from the Apostles time, till the raigne of King Edward the 6. For if in all this compasse either of time or place, including also the Apostles themselues, M. Mason can bring one instance, or example of a Bishop ordered in this sort, that M. Parker was, he shall gaine his cause. To bring therfore the approbation of halfe a dozen very ordinarie lawiers, no diuines, of no extraordinarie reputation for their integritie, and no more then ordinarie for their courage, and constancie, subiects to her that demaunded their opinions, a princesse peremptorie in her proceedings, and alreadie absolutelie resolued in her determination, whatsoeuer

their

their resolution should bee: demaunding their opinions (which she knew before hand would be according to her will) only for a slender maske, or pretence of some colour of law; to bring six such mens iudgment (I say) against the iudgment, and practice of the whole Christian world (for not only Catholiques, whom they stulie esteeme enemies to their heresie, though not to their persons, but all their owne brethren of the pretended reformation in France, Geneua, Germanie, Poland, Hungarie, Holland, Scotland, yea and in England it selfe, for the greater or at least for the more Zealous part, do all condemne, and disauowe their parlement Bishops, and cleargie) is not this I say most perfect senslesnes? Surelie such an argument is most fit to conclude, and shut vp in all securitie, the ordination of the first Metropolitan of so new a cleargie. Yet this default I do not so much ascribe to the want of iudgment in M. Mason, as to the want of truth in the matter he would maintaine, which must needs be very miserable standing in neede of such beggerly support.

After all this M. Mason filleth eight pages in deriuing the descent of their new cleargie from M. Parker, who being the first of that race (as M. Mason willinglie professeth) and yet not of full fiftie yeares antiquitie, their church whereof he was the first Pastor, cannot possiblie be the church of Christ, yet M. Mason confidentlie addeth. *The records alleaged are of such high credit and reputation, that they cannot possibly be infringed. As for the maine point wherupon all the rest dependeth, that is, the consecration of Archbishop Parker, as it was solemnely performed in a great assemblie, so it was published in print in his owne time, when all things were in fresh memory. And though some of his spitefull and bitter enemies did then scornfully comment vpon his life, yet the truth of this fact they neuer called in question.*

See his owne words in the beginning of this chapter. M. Parkers consecration is disproued, and consequentlie the consecrations of all the rest depending therupon.

What high credit or reputation his records are of, I leaue to the vnpartiall reader to iudge by that which hath bene hitherto said therof. And for the new proofe which he addeth heere of M. Parkers consecration saying *it was published in print in his owne time without being called in question*, it is a manifest vntruth. For both D. Harding, D. Saun-

ders, and D. Stapleton besides others (as is euident by their owne words before cited towards the end of the chapter before this) euen in his owne time, and some of them to himselfe did not only (without any touch of his life) call his consecration in question but absolutelie denied it, and that without any reply or disproofe made either by himselfe, or any other in his behalfe as is before shewed. Therfore if there were any such thing published in print, as M. Mason speaketh of, it went belike either in priuate amongst friends only who were willing to beleeue that which they desired to be true, or els was it esteemed to be of smal weight or authoritie, seing neither M. Parker himselfe, nor M. Iewell, nor M. Horne, though earnestlie called vpon for some proofe of their consecration, did neuer so much as once mention it; And thus much of M. Parkers consecration, the disproof wherof, is the disproof of the consecrations of all the rest of our English superintendents which as M. Mason saith depend thereupon.

The fifteenth Chapter.

That M. Grindall, M. Horne with the rest preferred to Bishopricks in the beginning of Q. Elizabeths raigne were not true, and lawfull Bishops

1. ALl the defects and inhabilities prooued either in Cranmer, the Bishops ordained in K. Edward the 6. his raigne, or in M. Parker, are manifestly found in these, of whom there is now question: and therfore if the proofes already produced against thothers hold good, it is a cleare case, that these men can neither be true, nor lawfull Bishops. Wherfore leauing them marked with these notes (*of no Bishops*) till they purge themselues, we will in this chapter examine, whether they had not yet some other inhability, which thothers had not.

And

And first it is euident, that when M. Grindall, M. Horne, and the rest (whose names I will by and by expresse out of M. Mason) were appointed to be Bishops, all the sees, whervnto they were nominated, were full, being possessed by true, and lawfull pastours. Therfore it is cleare, that these newly preferred must necessarily be violent intruders, and vsurpers, and no lawfull Bishops.

That the sees, whervnto these intendents were nominated, were full and not vacant, it is euident by this table set downe by M. Mason.

	Soes	Displaced	Placed	*Page* 134.
Prouinces *Cant.*	London.	Bonner.	Grindall.	
	Winchester.	White.	Horne.	
	Ely.	Thurlby.	Core.	
	Lincolne.	Watson.	Bullingham.	
	Cou:and Lichfield.	Bane.	Bentham.	
	Bath and wells.	Bourne.	Barkly.	
	Exon.	Turberuille.	Ally.	
	Worcester.	Pates.	Sandes.	
	Peterborrowe.	Poole.	Scambler.	
	Asaph.	Gouldwell.	Dauis.	
	Yorke.	Heath.	Young.	
Yorke.	Durham.	Tunstall.	Pilkinton.	
	Carlill.	Oglethorpe	Best.	
	Chester.	Scot.	Downhame.	

And that the displaced were lawfull Bishops, it is no lesse euident, neither their consecration, or any thing belonging therunto, being at any time called in question by any of their aduersaries euen vntill this day. It is therfore euident, that these new placed were intruders, and not lawfull Bishops.

2. This consequence, (supposing the displaced to haue bene lawfull Bishops, and not lawfully deposed, the first of which points is not denied, and the second shalbe prooued in due place) is both euident in it selfe, and prooued by infinite testimonies of antiquity. Whereof I will only bring one as out of the counsell of Sardis, wherof I make choice as well for that it is

most direct for this purpose, and of irrefragable authority, as for that by the same labour I meane to shew, how impertinently it is alleaged by M. Mason, in the behalfe of those, that in K. Edward time being thrust into Bishops sees, fled alway in Q. Maries time. In whose fauour to prooue, that they were lawfull Bishops of those sees, euen in the time of their absence he saith thus.

Pag. 129.

3. *Although the Arian faction preuailing, the councell of Tyre deposed Athanasius, yea and the councell of Antioch, in the presence and with the consent of the Emperour, did institute Gregory in his place, yet the councell of Sardica pronounced Athanasius (as also Marcellus, Asclepas, and other Catholique exiled Bishops) to be pure and innocet: And denyet that Gregory the vsurper of Alexandria, Basill of Ancyra, Quintianus of Gaza (which had entered like wolues vpon the churches of these men) should be called Bishops. So the councel iudged the churches to belong to the (Catholique) Bishops, euen at such time as they were exiled, and the Arians in possession: And accordingly they deposed Gregory with such like, and restored Athanasius and the rest with honour. Which act they signified in a synodicall epistle to the church of Alexandria, in this manner. We would haue you to know, that Gregory being made Bishop vnlawfully by heretiques, and brought by them vnto your city, is deposed from his Bishoprike by the whole synode, although in very deede he was neuer Bishop, therfore farewell, and receiue your Bishop Athanasius. Thus you see that though Athanasius fled away in time of persecution, though he were deposed by a councell, and another chosen in his place, with the consent of the Emperour: yet for all this he is iudged to be the true Bishop of Alexandria, and Gregory neuer to haue bene Bishop therof. The like is to be said of Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra, Asclepas Bishop of Gaza, Paulus Bishop of Constantinople, and others, who were persecuted for the Catholique faith, as well as Athanasius. Wherfore if you will conforme your iudgement to the councell of Sardica, you must confesse that such as in K. Edwards time were lawfully possessed of Bishoprikes (though in Q. Maries time being persecuted in one city they fled into another) did still retaine the titles of true Bishops, and that those that inuaded their churches were intruders, and vsurpers. Thus therfore it appeareth, that as Athanasius and the rest returning from exile, might ordaine, and do all such things as belonged to their episcopall office, euen so Bishop Barlow, Bishop Coverdall, and the rest returning from exile, might likewise ordaine, and iustify their proceedings in their episcopall function.*

Sozo. li. 2. c. 24.

Socra. li. 2. c. 5.

Note this words Catholique.

Heretiques make not Bishops lawfully.

Binnius to. 1. Pag 444.

They were not lawfully possessed, no more then Gregory was, whom is declared neuer to haue beene Bishop.

If M. Mason can apply this rightly to that purpose, for which he bringeth it, he shall no doubt gaine his cause. For the autho-

rity

rity he vſeth is authenticall. But he doth in this as one, that hauing ſtolne another mans euidence, and records, produceth them againſt the right owner, thinking therby to diſpoſeſſe him of his inheritance, but in fine the matter being brough to light he is ouerthrowne by the ſame proofes, which he alleageth for himſelf. So no doubt will it fall out with M. Maſon in this allegation. For I do not thinke, that any man could haue brought any thing more direct, either againſt thoſe in whoſe behalfe he bringeth it, or for them of whom the queſtion is here to wit Biſhop Heath, Thurlby Bonner, and the reſt of their fellow confeſſours depoſed by Queen Elyzabeth, whoſe caſe in all reſpects like vnto that of S. Athanaſius, Marcellus, Aſclepas, and their Catholique conſorts. And contrariwiſe the caſe of Young, Grindall, Horne, with the reſt of their crewe, wher of I count Barlow, Couerdall, and the reſt of K. Edw. Biſhops, becauſe their ordination is the ſame with thothers like to that of Gregory, Baſil, Quintianus and the others intruded by the Arian Emperour Conſtantius. Yet this diſparity there is betwixt the fact of Conſtantius, diſplacing Athanaſius with the other Catholique Biſhops, and intruding Gregory and his fellowes into their ſees: and the fact of Q. Elizabeth diſpoſſeſſing Biſhop Heath and Bonner with the reſt, and thruſting into their places M. Young, Grindall, and others: that Conſtantius ſeemed to proceed canonically in this fact, hauing the colour, and shew of the ſentence of two Synodes, to wit of Tyre and Antioch, though both hereticall aſſemblies, for the diſplacing of S. Athanaſius; wheras Q. Elizabeth made no difficulty, nor had any ſcruple to thruſt Catholique Biſhops out of their ſees, and intrude others into their roomes, without all shew, or colour of canonicall iudgment. So that the Arian Emperour Conſtantius, and the Arian Biſhops were much more religious in appearance then Q. Elizabeth, and the Biſhops of her creation, ſeeing they made ſcruple to commit ſo vniuſt and ſacrilegious a fact, as to depoſe Catholique Biſhops, and thruſt others in their roomes, without shew at leaſt of ſome Eccleſiaſticall and canonicall iudgment, wherof theſe made no difficulty. And if in defence of Q. Elizabeths fact it be replied, that she being the head of the church of England, might do that she did of her abſolute power, without the iudgment, or ſentence of any Synode, what shall we ſay of

Conſtan-

Constantius his fact? For if Q. Elizabeth was head of the church of England, he must necessarily be head of the church of the Empire, and therefore if her fact were iustifiable for that reason, his was iustifiable for the same, which notwithstanding was condemned by the councell. But it is euident, if any thing that is past be euident, that neither Constantius though an heretique, nor any other Emperour, King, or Prince, before Henry the 8. of England, Father to Q. Elizabeth, did euer challenge, or pretend to be head of the church, or to haue any iurisdiction in spirituall causes and matters, Farther then the power to putt in execution, the decrees and ordinances of the church. And this very case of the deposition of Athanasius doth sufficiently shew thus much of Constantius, who did no more, the putt in execution the vniust decrees, of the two hereticall assemblies before mentioned, which decrees he would not haue expected for the deposition of S. Athanasius, had he esteemed himselfe head of the church. Farther had he bene head of the church, what power could there haue remained in the church, to reuerse his sentence, which notwithstanding we see done in the councell of Sardis.

4. M. Mason, or some other in his behalfe will demaund the reasons, why this decree of the councell of Sardis for the restitution of S. Athanasius, and the deposition of Gregory the intruder, may not be as fitly applied to proone the restitution of Barlow, Couerdall, and others, together with the creation of Young, Grindall, and their fellowes by Q. Elizabeth, and the deposition of Heath, Bonner, and the rest to be, lawfull? as we say it may be applied, to proone the deposition of Heath and Bonner, with their fellowes, and the intrusion of Young, Grindall, and their company to be vn lawfull? I answere that the reason herof is euident. For this decree of the councell of Sardis being made, (as M. Mason truly noteth) in the behalfe of the Catholique Bishops extruded by the hereticall party, who entred as wolues, and were not Bishops, as the councell declared, cannot in any shew of reason be applied, or wrested, to fauour the hereticall party in preiudice of the Catholique. True, will M. Mason say: But why should the Bishops putt out of their seas by Q. Elizabeth, be esteemed Catholiques, rather then those that she putt into their places? Marrie for the

ſelfe ſame reaſon, for which S. Athanaſius and his fellowes were eſteemed, and were indeed true Catholique Biſhops, and their aduerſaries heretiques. And if M. Maſon aske what that reaſon was: I anſwere, that it was becauſe S. Athanaſius, and the reſt reſtored by the councell of Sardis, did communicate both in faith and Sacraments, with the whole Catholique church, both preſent and precedent, as alſo the Biſhops, thruſt out of their ſees by Q. Elizabeth, are knowne to haue done: wheras their aduerſaries, to wit, the Arians, made a ſect apart not heard of, before Arius reuolted from the Catholique church, breaking communion therwith both in faith and Sacraments; as in like ſort, the Biſhops intruded by Q. Elizabeth, who ſeparated themſelues from the vnity of the Catholique church, and made a ſect apart, neuer heard of in the world before Luthers reuolt, and apoſtacy. And if M. Maſon or any other can bring any thing to prooue Barlowe, Young, Grindall, with the reſt of their confeſſion to be Catholiques, which the Arrian Biſhops Gregory, Baſil and Quintianus depoſed, and condemned by the councell of Sardis, could not with as much, or more ſhew of truth, haue brought for themſelues; or contrariewiſe if he can alleadge any one thing to prooue, that S. Athanaſius was a Catholique, which may not with the ſame truth be alleaged for Biſhop Heath, and his fellowes, he ſhall gaine his cauſe in this point. And therfore do I conclude with M. Maſons owne words againſt himſelfe in this ſort. *Wherfore if you will conforme your iudgment to the councell of Sardis,* Pag. 139. *you muſt confeſſe that the Biſhops deposed by Q. Elizabeth, were the true Biſhops of their ſees, and thoſe that inuaded their churches, were intruders and vſurpers.*

5. And this is Farther prooued, by the continuall practice of the whole church, euen from the Apoſtles themſelues, wherin is not to be found one example of ſo many Biſhops depoſed, and thruſt out of their ſees, without the iudgment and ſentence of a councell. It is true that ſome princes vpon vniuſt indignation, haue forced diuers holy Biſhops to leaue their ſees, and tranſport themſelues into other countries, as (not going any Farther for examples) William Rufus did by S. Anſelme and Henry the 8. by S. Thomas, yet did they forbeare to put any others into their

places, so long as their cause was not iudged by ecclesiasticall sentence. And if any be found to haue proceeded further, in the iniust intrusion of some one, into the place of another iniustly deposed, without a synodicall sentence yet none was euer found, to haue proceeded in that sort against all the Bishops of a whole realme, but Q. Elizabeth, the first woman head of the church, that euer was in the world. And therfore no doubt, but if the case of the deposed should be examined, by a Synod of lawfull Bishops (to whom the hearing, and determining therof doth only pertaine) they would be iudged to haue bene the true Bishops of those sees, and thothers to be intruders, and vsurpres, not entring into the fold of Christ by the dore of canonicall election, and consecration, but climing vpp an other way by the power, and force of the secular Prince, and therfore could not be true pastors, but theeues and robbers, as our sauiour himselfe testifieth of them.

Ioh. 10. 1.

6. M. Mason, notwithstanding to iustify these men M. Young, Grindall, and the rest of intrusion, inditeth the deposed (after so many yeares that they are in the other world) of three things, wherof their greatest aduersaries neuer accused them, in their life time, when they might haue answered for themselues. So pious he is towards the departed, of whom (according to the common saying) *we ought to say nothing but well. How well* (saith he) *they* Bishop Bonner, White, and the rest before mentioned) *deserued at the Queenes hands, may appeare by their behauiour in three points, concerning the coronation, disputation, and excommunication. In the two first, they refused to be actors; and for the third, they consulted whether they should excommunicate the Queene, or no.*

Page 101.

Of these three things M. Mason (thinking to find therin some colourable matter to iustify the vniust deposition of those venerable Pastors, and the intrusion of the new intendents, maketh a large dispute, which I intend not here to repeate, but will make in briefe this answere. First none of all these three points was obiected against them as any cause, or occasion of their deposition, which doubtles would not haue bene omitted by their aduersaries, if they had bene thought materiall for that purpose. Secondly it is false, that all the deposed were culpable of these things (supposing they were faults) Owen Oglethorpe Bishop of Carlill, neither consenting to excommunicate the

Queene,

Queene, not yet refuſing to crowne her, for as M. Maſon ſaith and all men know he ſet the crowne vpon her head, whom notwithſtanding ſhe depoſed, for continuing in his Catholique religion, and refuſing the oath of ſupremacy, as M. Maſon himſelf teſtifieth in expreſſe words, which indeed was the only cauſe of all their depoſition, as we ſhall ſee by and by. *Pag.* 125.

Thirdly ſuppoſe, that all M. Maſon ſaith concerning theſe points were true, (as it is not) yet ſhould they not therfore haue deſerued depoſition. For neither S. Ambroſe, not Euphemius Patriarch of Conſtantinople were yet euer ſo cenſured by any, though the firſt, both refuſed diſputation with the Arrians for the like reaſons, for which thoſe Catholique Bishops did refuſe to proceede in the diſputations appointed with ſuch vnequall conditions as were preſcribed and alſo did excommunicate the Emperour Theodoſius indeede, and not only in conſultation. And the ſecond refuſed to acknowledg Anaſtaſius for Emperour, but called him heretique, and vnworthy to rule ouer Chriſtians, till he gaue him a proteſtation in writing to embrace the doctrine of the councell of Calcedon. *Ambro. li. 2. epiſt. 13. Ruffinus li. 2 hiſt. Theodor. Anagnoſtes li. 2. coll. hiſtor. eccleſiaſtic.*

Fourthly, the only true cauſe of their depoſition, being the profeſſion of the Catholique Romane faith, and their refuſall to ſweare that the Queene was ſupreame head of the church, as not only Sanders, but alſo Stow affirmeth, yea and M. Maſon himſelf confeſſeth both in Bishop Oglethorpe, as we haue already ſeene, and in all the reſt, in this title. *Of the oath of the princes ſupremacy, for denying whereof the old Biſhops were deprined*, he doth ignorantly and impertinently multiply ſo many words in theſe other points, which appertaine nothing to the purpoſe he goeth about: which is to iuſtifie the depoſition of Bishop Heath, Bonner, and the reſt, that therby he may make way, for the lawfull entry of the intruded. *Pag.* 1082. *impreſſion* 1605. *Pag.* 113.

7. This controuerſie therfore ſtandeth in this only point, whether the Queene and her councell, could lawfully depoſe thoſe Bishops for refuſing to ſweare, that ſhe was head of the church or no? For if they were not lawfully depoſed; it will neceſſarily follow that thoſe, who were putt into their ſees, were manifeſt intruders, and therfore no lawfull Bishop, and that they were not lawfully depoſed, belongeth to me to proo-

ue against M. Mason; in proofe wherof I will vse this only argument.

No iudiciall action is of validity where the agent hath no authority with M. Mason pa. 107.

No sentence or iudgment can be lawfull, but where the iudge hath lawfull and competent power, both ouer the cause and persons iudged. But the Queene, and her councell (whether they be taken iointly or seuerally) had no lawfull and competent power ouer these Bishops, and the cause for which they were iudged by them. Therfore their sentence and iudgment of deposition pronounced against them could not be lawfull.

In this whole argument there is nothing that needeth proofe, but only the second proposition, which I will make good both by diuine, and humane authority, supposing first, that which is euident and cannot be denied, to wit, that the parties iudged were Bishops, the cause a point, or article of faith and religiō; and that the iudges were lay, or seculer persons. This being presupposed I say thus.

Those, who are appointed, and authorised by God, to teach vnto others all matters of faith, and religion, cannot in the same matters of faith and religion be subiect to their iudgment, who are bound to heare and learne the same of them: for otherwaies the scholler should be aboue his maister euen in that, wherin he is his maister, contrary both to the light of reason, and the expresse doctrine of our Sauiour Christ. But the Bishops, and Pastors of Gods church are *Matth.10.24* appointed, and authorised by him, to teach all temporall men, as well the highest Princes, as the meanest people, all matters of faith, and religion. Therfore the Bishops, and Pastors of Gods church cannot be subiect to temporall mens iudgment, (though they be princes) in matters of faith, and religion: And consequently temporall Princes cannot haue authority, or power to iudge them therin. Whence it is euidently concluded, that the Qeeene and her councell, being seculer, or lay persons had not, nor could haue any lawfull and competent power, ouer these Bishops in the cause iudged by them. I adde of purpose these words (in matters of faith and religion) becauſe I will not enter here into that other question, whether eccleſiaſticall persons are exempted in all cauſes, from the iudgment of the

secular court, or tribunall, because this question is nothing necessarie for the determination of the controuersie here proposed.

The first proposition of this argument, being of it selfe cleare to all men of any vnderstanding, and the conclusion following directlie of the premises, there remaineth only the second proposition, which may seeme to haue neede of proofe. Notwithstanding in prouing this, will I also proone thother, for the fuller satisfaction of those, that may haue any doubt therof. That Bishops therfore and Pastors are authorised by God, to teach all men their faith, and beleefe, which is the proposition cheeflie to be prooued, it is euident by the testimonie of our Sauiour himselfe, saying: *All power is giuen me in heauen, and in earth: Going therfore teach ye all nations: teaching them to obserue all things whatsoeuer I haue commaunded you: And behold I am with you all daies euen to the consummation of the world.* Which last words do shew, that this power to teach all men all matters necessarie for their saluation, was not meant to the Apostles only, to whom our Sauiour then spake (because they were not to continue till the worlds end) but also to all such, as should succeede them in the function of Pastors, as Bishops do. Matth. 28, 19. 20.

The same proposition together with thother, *that Bishops cannot be iudged in matters of religion by secular persons*, is as euidentlie proued by the testimonie likewise of our Sauiour himselfe, saying to those whom he sent to preach. *He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.* He therfore (may we say in the person of Christ) that iudgeth you, iudgeth mee; which is true at least in matters of faith and religion, wherin he hath ordained them preachers and teachers. Luke 10. 16.

The same is yet more clearelie conuinced out of the doctrine of S. Paul, saying. *Obay your prelates, and be subiect vnto them. For they watch as being to render account for your soules.* For it is euident, that our prelates, and pastors cannot be subiect to vs, and to our power in those things, wherin we are by Gods ordinance subiect vnto them, and they haue charge ouer vs (no more then the sunne being aboue the moone can also be vnder it) but we are subiect to our prelates, in matters pertaining to our soules, in such sort, as they are to giue an account therof, as S. Hebr. 13. 17.

Paul testifieth, And therfore they cannot be subiect vnto vs, nor iudged by vs therin.

Act. 20. Farther, God hath appointed Bishops to gouerne his church, which he purchased with his blood, as witnesseth S. Paul, how therfore can they be commaunded, or iudged by them, who are or ought to be members of the same church, whereof they haue the gouernment by Gods owne appointment?

To these few but firme testimonies of diuine authoritie, I will according to my promise adde one or two humane, not to adde force to the former, but to declare, what hath bene the sense of the greatest iudgments, of former ages in this point.

Constantine the great, the glory of our countrie, worthilie honoured for many memorable deeds, and sayings, who had as great right to all power pertaining to temporall princes, as any other whatsoeuer, was so farre from chalenging iurisdiction ouer Bishops, in matters of faith and religion, that he disclaimed from all power, to iudge of their priuate complaints made one against another, saying; *God hath made you priests, and hath giuen you power to iudge vs; and therfore are we rightly iudged by you. But you cannot be iudged by men, wherfore expect the iudgment of God only, and reserue your complaints to his diuine examination. For you are giuen to vs by God as Gods, and it is not conuenient that man iudge Gods, but he alone of whom it is written, God stood in the Synagogue of Gods.*

Ruff. l. 1. c. 1.

Sozomen. l. 6 c. 7. And *Valentinian* the first. *It is not graunted to me being a lay man to attribute vnto my selfe these iudgments.*

Epist. ad synod. Ephesin. Bui. to. 1. pag. 732 *Theodosius* also the younger together with Valentinian. *It is not lawfull for him that is no Bishop, to meddle with the decision, or iudgment of ecclesiastical matters.*

These great Monarchs, who knew as well as any others, what pertained to their right, were farre from iudging their prelates, and pastors in matters of religion; and much farther from chaleging vnto themselues, the headship of Gods church. But seeing they disclaime from this power, let vs see whether peraduenture the pastors of the church in those times did attribute it vnto them. Certes no such thing, but quite the contrary, *It is not lawfull for vs* (saith the great Hosius of Corduba to Constantius Emperour) *to hold the Empire vpon earth, nor for you to take into your hands the censer, and vsurpe authority in religiõ.* And S. Athanasius the glory of

Epist. ad Constantium apud Athan. Epist. ad Solitar. ag.

of pastors. *VVhen was it heard from the memory of man, that Ecclesiasticall iudgment? had their force from the Emperour?* And againe *The question is not of the affaires of the Roman commonwealth, where you haue power as Emperour: But the question is of a Bishop.* And yet againe, *VVho seeing the Emperour president, in counsell of Ecclesiasticall matters, will not iudge, that it is the abomination of desolation foretold by Daniell? S. Gregory Nazianzen* some what behind them in time, but of equall authoritie. *VVill you heare (O President) a free speach? the law of Christ hath made you subiect to my iurisdiction, and to my tribunall; for we haue also an Empyre, yea a greater, and more perfect then that of yours, vnlesse it be fit to subiect the soule to the body and heauenly things to earthly.* And *S. Ambrose* the most auncient of the foure doctors of the west church. *VVho will deny if we looke either into the holy scripture, or antiquity, but that Bishops are accustomed to iudge Christian Emperours in matters of faith* and not Emperours to iudg Bishops? Againe. *Your father said it appertaineth not to me to iudge betweene Bishops, and your clemency saith, I ought to iudge.* And yet again: *when did you euer heare most gratious Emperour that in matters of faith laymen iudged Bishops?* And his Maiestie our dread soueraigne doth testify the same truth in these expresse words. *It is true, that the Emperours did neuer auow themselues to be soueraigne iudges, in matter of faith and doctrine.* And a litle after. *I confesse that it is a point of diuinity, to iudge how far the power of the keies reacheth: and that cleargy may, and ought to vse their censures against those princes, that make warre against Iesus Christ, without making the laity iudges therof.*

Epist. ad solit. vit. agentes. Ibidem.

Ibid.

Orat. ad eiusdem perculsos & princip. irascentē.

Epist. 13. ad Valenti. Iuniorem.

In his declaratiō against Cardi. du Perron pag. 70. impressiō of Paris.

Thus we see it most cleare, both by diuine and humane, Ecclesiasticall, Emperiall, and Regall authoritie, that seculer persons, be they princes or others, can haue no iurisdiction, or power ouer Bishops, in matters of faith and religion. Neither is the contrarie maintained by any of the pretended reformation, our parlement prelates only excepted: who as the haue no other origen, or beginning, but the temporall power of the prince, so can they expect no other vphold but from the same. And therfore do they, not for the princes right, but for their owne interest, labour to maintaine that Paradox of the supreame authoritie of temporall princes, in spirituall or Ecclesiasticall causes, which is odious and contemned, euen by their owne reformed brethren, as appeareth by Calvin himselfe, who calleth it *Nasseuy and sacrilege*. And the Centurists say of the ciuill

Amos 7. 13.

Magi-

Præfat. contur. 7. pag. 11 ante mediũ. Epist. ad electorem Brãdeburg.

Magistrates. *Non sunt capita ecclesiæ, quia ipsis non competit iste primatus:* that is, *they are not heads of the church, for this primacy belongeth not to them.* And Chemnitius saith of Q. Elizabeth. *Fæmineo & à sæculis inaudito fastu, se Papissam & caput ecclesiæ fecit. She made her self Pope, and head of the church, by a womanish and vnheard of pride.*

6. Now for the preuenting, and satisfying of all such arguments, as vsuallie are brought either against this euident truth, or for proofe of the contrarie, I would haue thee (iudicious reader) diligentlie to obserue, that temporall princes haue power to make lawes for the conseruation, and increase of Catholique religion, and for the suppression, and extirpation of all sort of infidelitie, whether it be heresie, Iudaisme, or Paganisme yea this is their greatest honour, and the chiefest reason, for which they are endewed with the soueraigne power of the sword, and for this are they called in the holy scripture *nourishers, or nurses of the church.* But, what is truth in all points of faith and religion, wherin question may be moued, they are to learne of their Pastors, and Prelates, to whom God hath giuen commission, and authoritie to teach all men all things necessarie for their saluation; I say they are to learne this of them, and not to teach it vnto them: yet hauing learned it, the are bound not only to beleeue it themselues, but also to maintaine, and defend it by the power of their scepter, against all inuasions of heresie, or other falsitie whatsoeuer. By which only obseruation are answered all the arguments drawne, either from the facts of Kings, as well in the Iewish, as Christian church, interposing their authoritie in Ecclesiasticall, or spirituall matters (I speake only of approoued facts) or from the councels, and fathers solliciting, or mouing them therunto. For no King either of the one, or other church hath (with approbation and allowance) euer attempted any thing in matter of religion, contrarie and repugnant to the iudgment of the Pastors, and Prelates of the vniuersall church then militant vpon earth, which is the only faithfull keeper, and infallable interpreter of Gods law, in matters pertaining to mens saluation; and therfore is called by S. Paul *the house of the liuing God, the piller and ground of truth.* And that temporall Princes haue no other power, or iurisdiction, in matters of religion then this, M. Mason is forced to graunt.

Esay 49. 23.

Math. 28. 20

1. ad Timoth.

Pag. 113.

7. For hauing alleaged for the proofe of the Princes supremacie

macy in spirituall causes: that Gratian the Emperour made a law against the Arrians, commanding them like wild beasts, to be driuen from the churches, and the places to be restored to good Pastors, committing the execution therof to Sapor his captaine: and inferring therupon, that Q. Elizabeth might with more reason do the like, because of the necessitie, and want of good Bishops, wherof there were plentie in his time. He obiecteth to himself: that Gratian hauing the determination of synodes, condemning the Arrians, he might lawfullie make such a law, and commit the execution therof to his captaine.

To which obiection what answere maketh he, thinke you? Marie *that Q. Elizabeth had also for her supremacy, the determination of a Synode of Bishops wherof Bishop Fisher was one, which synode gaue to K. Henry the title of supreame head, of the church of England, which was renewed in another Synode two yeeres after. And two yeares after that, the two vniuersities deliuered their iudgment. That the Pope had no more to do in England by the Law of God, then any other Bishop.*

In which answere is first to be noted, the graunt of that, which the obiectiō intendeth, to wit, that the Queene without the determination of a Synode, could not make any law concerning matter of religion: whence it euidentlie followeth, that all the lawes made in her raigne, in preiudice of the Catholique Romane faith, are vniust, as not proceeding from true, and lawfull authoritie, no Synode hauing determined any such lawes to be either good or lawfull.

Secondlie, for as much as concerneth this particuler point of supremacie, wherof the presēt question is: the Synodes wherof he speaketh, are not extant, but thone in a manuscript as he saith, and thother [illegible]where. But let it be, that there was such a synodicall determination, as he speaketh of, of what authoritie could it be? Surely of none at all. For first the same parties, that consented to that determination in King Henries time, recalled and disauowed their owne fact in Q. Maries raigne, as M. Mason himselfe confesseth: yea Bishop Fisher, (whom he fraudulently here nameth as not dissenting from that decree) is knowne to all the world, to haue died for the defence of the contrarie. And though he neuer consented to the new title of the Kings supremacie, yet hauing once said, that he would graunt it so farre, as it was agreeable with holy scriptures,

Saunders de schismate lib. 3.

did penaunce all his life after, for that fearefull ſpeach, knowing and confeſſing that he being a Bishop, and therfore bound to inſtruct others, as hauing charge ouer their ſoules, ſhould not haue ſpoken in that doubtfull manner, but ſhould haue ſaid, that it was whollie repugnant to holy ſcriptures, that others might therby haue bene kept from errour.

Farthermore, what authoritie can a ſynode of the Bishops of one only nation haue, being aſſembled by the commaundement of their owne King within his owne dominions, in a matter moſt earneſtly affected, and purſued by him: what authoritie I ſay, can ſuch a ſynode haue againſt the iudgmēt of all the whole world beſides? First this ſynode if it be to be called ſo, was no lawfull or generall councell, as the weight and moment of that matter would haue required. Secondly, it was no free councell, as appeareth as well by the circumſtances already mentioned, as by the changing of their opinions afterwards, which only conſideration (of want of freedome) is ſufficient to make it of none authoritie, as it did that great councell of Arriminum, which after the threates of the Arrian Emperour Conſtantius, was neuer holden to be a free councell, nor the decrees therfore of any force. Therfore (to apply all that which hath hitherto bene ſaid to the matter now in queſtion) if there had bene any iuſt cauſe of depoſition probablie ſuſpected in Bishop Heath, and the reſt, why was not their cauſe committed to the examination of the reſt of the Bishops of the church, as the cuſtome grounded vpon manifeſt reaſon, and equitie hath euer bene, in caſes of difference betweene Bishops and their owne Prince? In which caſe if they had bene found culpable, their depoſition had bene iuſtifiable to all the world. But they were well knowne to be without all fault worthie of depoſition, nor could in any equall, or competent iudgment, haue bene found guiltie of any crime deſeruing it: Therfore their depoſition being already decreed, to make roome for thoſe that were to be intruded, it was neceſſarie they ſhould be iudged by ſuch, as would aſſuredlie finde them guiltie, though they were neuer ſo innocent.

The caſe of theſe venerable Prelates being thus, as hath bene mentioned, Let any indifferent man iudge, whether their depoſition was iuſt, or no, and conſequentlie, whether thoſe,

those, that were thrust into their roomes, were lawfullie inuested therin.

M. Mason from the page 106. to the page 113. laboureth to iustifie the deposition of these Bishops by the example of Abiather deposed by Solomon. His argument in briefe is this. Salomon deposed Abiather high Priest, and put another in his place. Therfore Queene Elizabath might do the like by the Bishops of her kingdome. I answere that though we should suppose, first that the fact of Salomon was iust and lawfull which is not euident, Secondly that he did depose Abiather as King and not as a Prophet, by speciall reuelation or warrant which is vncertaine. Thirdly, that the Priests and Priesthood of the old and new law are of equall dignitie and priuiledge, which with all true Christians is euidentlie false. Though (I say) we should suppose all these things, yet is this argument altogether impertinent for M. Masons purpose. For Abiathers case was altogether different from that of the Catholique Bishops, of whom the question is here; his case being meerelie temporall, to wit the conspiring against Salomon in behalfe of his brother Adonias, which had it not bene in the person of a Priest, should without all controuersie haue belonged to the triall of the temporall tribunall, whereas theirs was a case of faith and religion, which though it had not bene in the persons of Priests, yet could it not haue bene iudged by the temporall Magistrate, as is alreadie shewed both by diuine and humane, Ecclesiasticall and temporall, imperiall and regall authoritie. Most impertinentlie therfore is this fact of Salomon deposing Abiather, alleaged for the iustification of that of Queene Elizabeth deposing the Catholique Bishops.

3. Reg. 2. 26.

After this argument of Abiathers deposition, M. Mason putteth great force, he sweateth hard in iustifying the oath of supremacie, for refusall wherof he confesseth the old Bishops to haue bene deposed. And for answere (besides that which hath bene alreadie said in this chapter for proofe of the contrarie) I will remit the reader to the last chapter of this treatise, where he shall find how opposite the oath of supremacie is to the Protestants owne doctrine, and therfore needeth no other refutation by the Catholique partie.

The sixteenth Chapter,

Of the oath of the Princes supremacie, for denying whereof the old Bishops were depriued.

1. THis is the title of the third chapter of M. Masons 3 booke. Where first is to be noted, the true cause of the depriuation of the Bishops to haue bene the refusall to sweare, that the Queene was supreame had of the church of Englād in spirituall causes. And therfore the 3 other points obiected against them by M. Mason, and already reiected, are meere impertinencies of his owne. Secondlie, that here I am only to answere the argūments, that M. Mason bringeth for the proofe of this supremacie, and not to proue the contrarie, which is alreadie performed in the precedent chapter. To come therfore to the point, M. Mason hauing in the beginning of this chapter alleaged, for the proofe of the Queenes supremacie in spirituall causes, that Marcian, Iustinian, Theodosius, and Gratian Emperours made lawes pertaining to Ecclesiasticall affaires, and frustrated the same allegation by saying, that these Princes followed therin the determinatiō of Synodes, which he would haue to be true also in Q. Elizabeth, as we haue seene and refuted before. he commeth to cite these words out of Card. Alen. *Apol. cap. 1.* *was there euer any King or Queene, Christian or heathen, Catholique or heretique in all the world beside, before our age, that did practice, chalenge, or accept of this title of supremacy?* Wherunto he maketh this answere *Look into the godly Kings of Iuda; looke into the proceedings of Christian Emperours, Constantine, Gratian, Theodosius, and such like, looke into the lawes of Charles, and Lodowike: and you shall see, that they practised as much, as euer we ascribed to the Queene in this oath.* *Pag. 114.*

But first M. Masō bringeth no one fact of any one of all these, prouing the practise of this supremacy, which was very necessary he should haue done. Secondly, by this answere, if he will

stand therunto, it wilbe very easy to couince him either of treason, against the Queene if shee were liuemg and her lawes, or of manifest falsity. For if he say, that by the oath of supremacy, he ascribeth to the Queene no other power then that, which these Emperours practised, he shall by the lawes of England be guilty of high treason; they hauing neuer practised any other power in ecclesiasticall affaires, then that which standeth well with the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, which M. Mason is bound by the lawes of England, vnder the paine of high treason to abiure. If he ascribe vnto her by the oath, any other power then that may stand with the Popes supremacy, then is that false, which he here affirmeth, to wit, that by the oath of supremacy, they ascribe no other power to the Quene, then these Emperours practised. The testimonies before alleged out of Constantine, and Theodosius owne mouthes, as they are faithfully related by authenticall authors, do proue for their parts, that they neuer practised any power, which did not stand well with the Popes supremacy. And as for Gratian, M. Mason himself confesseth, that in making lawes pertaining to ecclesiasticall matters, he followed the determination of Synodes, and therfore did not take vpon him supreame iudgment therin. Charles the great is so farre from the practise of supreame power of the church, that he alleadgeth and approoueth the examples, and sayings of Constantine, and of Valentinian Emperours for the contrary, saying. *Constantine answered that it was not lawfull for him, to iudge the causes of Bishops.* Againe. *Valentinian* (saith he) *answered, your cause is aboue vs, and therfore iudge your causes amongst your selues, for you are aboue vs.* Now if M. Mason do giue to Bishops this power aboue the Queene, that these Emperours doe, he shalbe a traitor by the lawes of England, which giue to the Queene, supreame power in all causes. If he do not, then is it false to say, that he ascribeth no other power to Queene Elizabeth, then these Emperours practised: Let him take whether part he will. But he goeth on;

In the oath of supremacy and the statute made for the reuiuall of the same anno. 1. Eli.

Capitularia Caroli Mag. l. 6. cap. 302.

2. *When the Councell of Ephesus, by the packing of Dioscorus had allowed the cursed opinion of Eutiches, and deposed Flauianus Bishop of Constantinople, Pope Leo vpon this occasion wrote thus vnto the Emperour Theodosius. Behold most Christian and reuerend Emperour, I, with the rest of my fellow Bishops make supplication vnto you, that all things may stand in the same fa-*

te, in which they were before theſe iudgments, vntill a greater number of Biſhops may be gathered out of the whole world. Who made this ſupplication? Pope Leo an holy, and learned Pope. To whom? To the Emperour Theodoſius. For what? that all things might ſtand in their former ſtate. What things meaneth he? The higheſt myſteries of religion, concerning the nature and perſon of Chriſt. But what is it to ſtand in the former ſtate? That it might be lawfull for all men, ſo to iudge and ſpeake of theſe holy miſteries, as they did before the ſpringing vp of the Eutichian hereſy: for then they held the truth according to the Apoſtolique faith. And thus he beſeecheth the Emperour to commaund, notwithſtanding the contrary determination of the counſel of Epheſus.

Here is a great deale of Cry, but to little purpoſe S. Leo intreateth the Emperour Theodoſius, that notwithſtanding the violent iudgment, of the hereticall aſſembly holden at Epheſus, wherby the Catholique faith was euidently impugned, and the Eutichian hereſie approoued, he would commaund that all things ſhould remaine in the ſame ſtate, they were before that wicked iudgment. Therfore (inferreth M. Maſon) hath the Emperour authority to commaund what to iudge and ſpeake in the higheſt miſteries of religion, concerning the perſon and natures of Chriſt. A ſtrange illation. If Clement the ſeauenth had written in the ſame tearmes to Henry the 8. concerning the title of ſupreame head of the church, giuen him by the Synode of Biſhops mentioned before by M. Maſon (as doubtles he would haue done, if he had had the like occaſiō to hope, that he would haue hearkened to his requeſt, as S. Leo had of Theodoſius) M. Maſon would not for all that (I ſuppoſe) infert therupon, that Pope Clement eſteemed King Henry to haue authority to commaund, what ſhould be iudged, and ſpoken of that matter. Certes S. Leo his words import no more, but that the Emperour would not in any ſort fauour, or ſtrengthen the wicked decree of Dioſcorus and his complices, and therby make himſelf partaker of their ſinne (as he ſaith) knowing right well (as none of common ſenſe can be ignorant) how much force the fauour of the Prince hath, for maintaining either of the Catholique truth, or for the bolſtering of the contrary, though he haue not any deciding power therin. And that S. Leo did not aſcribe vnto the Emperour any deciſiue, much leſſe ſupreame power in that matter, it is manifeſt by the ſame epiſtle. For firſt he

herequeſteth a ſuſpenſion, of the decree of the falſe Epheſine councell, only vntill a greater number of Bishops through the whole church, should be called together in councell, that might determine that controuerſie: wherby it is more then manifeſt, that S. Leo attributed the power to iudge that matter, to the paſtors of the church, and not to the Emperour.

Secondly Flauianus who was wrõgfully depoſed by the packing of Lioſcorus (as M. Maſon well ſaith) appealing from that ſentence, deliuered his appeale into the hands of the Popes Legates, as to the Lieutenants of his ſupreame iudge, and did not addreſſe himſelf to the Emperour, which he would not haue omitted, if he had eſteemed him ſupreme iudge in his cauſe.

Thirdly Theodoſius himſelfe diſclaimeth not only from ſupreame power in Eccleſiaſticall matters, but from all power therin, ſaying: *It is not lawfull for me being no Bishop, to meddle with the deciſiõ, or iudgment of Eccleſiaſticall matters.* *Epiſt. ad Synod. Epheſin.*

And here I will put M. Maſon in mind of one thing, which he noteth well againſt his owne hereſie, which is, that as before the ſpringing vp of the Eutichian hereſie, all men held the truth of our Sauiours two diſtinct natures in one perſon, ſo alſo before the ſpringing vp of the Lutheran hereſie, all men held the truth in all thoſe points, wherin he and his differeth from the ſame: and conſequently as Euthices was to be called backe to that faith, which was in the church before his hereſie ſprang vp, ſo are likewiſe the Lutherans, and all their progeny. But he prooueth by another epiſtle of S. Leo to Marcian the Emperors ſupremacy. S. Leo ſaith thus.

3. *The ſecond councell of Epheſus, which apparantly ſubuerted the faith, cannot rightly be called a councell, which your highnes for loue to the truth, will make voide by your decree to the contrary, moſt glorious Emperour. I therfore earneſtly requeſt, and beſeech your maieſty by our lord* Ieſus-Chriſt, *the founder and guider of your kingdome: that in this councell (of Chalcedon) which is preſently to be kept, you will not ſuffer the faith to be called in queſtiõ, which our bleſſed Fathers preached, being deliuered vnto them from the Apoſtles, neither permitt ſuch things as haue bene long ſince condemned by them, to be freshly reuiued againe, but that you will rather commaund, that the conſtitutions of the auncient councell of Nice may ſtand in force, the interpretation of heretiques being remooued.* Thus farr S. Leo, as M. Maſon relateth his words. Whervpon he ſaith. *Here the Pope aſcribeth to the Empe-* *Leo epiſt. 43.*

Marke here the auctority of traditions fathers, and councels.

your power to ratify, and establish those councells, that they call not the will of God in question. Which the Emperour Marcians practised, entring the councell of Chalcedon in his owne person, and forbidding the Bishops to assent any thing, concerning the birth of our Sauiour, otherwise then was conteyned in the Nicene creed. Moreouer when the councell of Chalcedon was concluded, Pope Leo wrote thus againe to the Emperour. Because I must by all meanes obay your piety, and most religious will, I haue willingly giuen my consenting sentence to these Synodicall constitutions, which concerning the confirmation of the Catholique faith, and condemnation of heretiques pleased me very well. The Emperour required the Pope to subscribe, and he did so cheerfully, protesting that for his part, he must by all meanes obey the Princes will in these cases. Now tell me, whether the Pope did not acknowledge the Emperour, and the Emperour shew himselfe to be supreame Gouernour ouer all persons, euen in causes ecclesiasticall?

Leo epist. 59.

Neither thone nor thother can be probably gathered, much lesse clearly prooued out of these testimonies. For the first is only a fatherly, or pastorlie admonition to the Emperour, exhorting him in sweete manner to maintaine the decreese, of the pastors of Gods church, which as a Catholique Prince he was bound to doe, and which he practised precisely, according to the Popes direction, and not as hauing supreame power therin, forbidding that any thing should be affirmed, of the birth of our Sauiour Christ, *otherwise then was conteined in the Nicene councell, and in the epistle of the most holy Bishop of Rome S. Leo vnto Flauianus* which latter words M. Mason malitiously leaueth out, least the reader should see, what respect the Emperour bare vnto the Bishop of Rome, proposing his doctrine to the councell, as a rule of truth.

Cecil. Chalcedon. apud Bin. to. 2. pag. 4.

The second allegatiō is as litle to the purpose: for these words *because I must by all meanes obay your piety, and religious will* (wherin consisteth the force of M. Masons illation) do not import any bōd, or obligation of duty, which the Pope had to the Emperour in that matter, as an inferiour to his superiour, but a prompt and readie fulfilling of his reasonable, and religious request, as euidently appeareth by the Epistle following, written at the same time, and of the same matter to Pulcheria the Empresse, where the Pope writeth thus. *And for as much as the most Godly Emperour would, that I should write to all the Bishops, that were present in the councell of Chalcedon, whereby I might confirme the things, that were defined there touching*

touching the rule of faith, I willingly performed it: leaſt the crafty diſſimulation of ſome ſhould make my iudgment doubtfull. Where M. Maſon may ſee, that the Emperour did not deſire the Pope, to ſubſcribe to the councell, as other Bishops had done, but to confirme that, which they had decreed, neither did he commaund him to do it, but willed him only, as a thing profitable, and conuenient, to make cleare his opinion in thoſe points, which ſome craftily would haue called into doubt, as the Pope himſelfe in the former words declareth. Wherby it euidently appeareth, of what force the iudgment of the ſee Apoſtolique was then, for the deciding of controuerſies in faith.

But if M. Maſon ſtand yet in doubt of S. Leo his iudgment in this point of ſupremacy, let him take the paines to reade (amongſt others of his epiſtles written in the cauſe of Eutiches) his 7. epiſtle to Theodoſius Emperour, where he ſhall ſee, that he eſteemeth himſelf, (as Bishop of the ſee Apoſtolique) to be ſupreme iudge in matters pertaining to faith, and religion, which he alſo sheweth plainly in the epiſtle immediatly following.

4. *As the Emperour Marcian* (ſaith M Maſon) *did practiſe this ſupremacy, ſo the Emperour Baſill did chalenge the title, when he ſaid in the councell of Conſtantinople: that the gouernment of the vniuerſall Eccleſiaſticallship, was committed vnto him by the diuine prouidence.* Cōcil. 8. act. 1. Bin. to. 3. Pag 880.

But becauſe Surius readeth this ſentence in the perſon of Baſill, thus: *VVhen the diuine, and moſt benigne prouidence had committed vnto vs the gouernment of the vniuerſall ship.* And Binnius thus: *The diuine and gratious prouidence of God, committing vnto you (the Bishops) the gouernment of the eccleſiaſticall ship:* out of neither of which readings he cannot draw any argument for his purpoſe, he ſaith, that neither of them reade it truly: thone leauing out the word (eccleſiaſticall) and thother putting in (you) for (vs) ſo that he would haue it reade thus. *The diuine prouidence of God hauing committed vnto vs, the gouernment of the vniuerſall eccleſiaſticall ship. VVherby* (ſaith he) *it is euident, that the Emperour Baſill did chalenge the gouernment of the vniuerſallship, both eccleſiaſticall and ciuill, and that in a generall councell, no man reſiſting him. VVhat doth this differ from ſupreame gouernor, as it is vſed in the church of England?*

But firſt who would not rather thinke, that M. Maſon

corrupteth the reading, either putting in the word (*ecclesiasticall*) or chaunging the word (*you*) into (*vs*) seeing he citeth no copy, or author for this reading, wheras either of the other readings hath at least one graue author. He bringeth some coniectures for the proofe of his reading, which proue nothing at all. But because I will not bestow many words in this matter, I will giue him that which he cannot proue, and will suppose his reading to be true: and yet if he dare stand to the iudgment of the Emperour Basill, will euicte my cause against him, or els I wilbe content to loose it for euer. Neither will I repeate all he saith to this purpose in the whole 8. generall councell, for that would be ouer tedious, I will therfore relate only a few periods of his speach, made in the end of the councell. Where first he auoucheth in expresse words, *that to lay men it is not graunted by the rule of the church, to speake any thing at all* (in councell or by way of iudgment) *in ecclesiasticall matters, which* (saith he) *is the worke of Bishops, and priests.* And after his speach to the Bishops, he saith thus to the nobility, with the rest of the laity.

Binn. to. 3. Pag 861.

But as concerning you, that are of the laie sort, as well you that beare offices, as priuate persons, I haue no more to say, but that it is not lawfull for you by any meanes, to moue talke of ecclesiasticall matters, neither to resist in any point the integrity of the church, or the vniuersall Synode. For to search and seeke out these matters, belongeth to Patriarches, Bishops, and Priests, which are gouernours by office: who haue power to sanctifie, to bind, and to loose: Who haue the keies of heauen, and of the church. It belongeth not vnto vs, who ought to be fedd, who haue neede to be sanctified, to be bound, and to be loosed from bonds. For of whatsoeuer religion, or wisdome the lay man be, yea though indewed with all internall vertues, so long as he is a lay man, he shall not cease to be called a sheepe. Againe a Bishop howsoeuer vnuenerable he be, and naked of all vertue, so long as he is a Bishop, and preacheth duly the word of truth, he suffereth not the losse of his Pastorall vocation, and dignity. What then haue we to doe being yet sheepe? The Pastors haue power to discusse the subtilty of words, and to seeke and find out such things as are aboue vs. We must therfore in feare, and sincere sort harken vnto them, and reuerence their contenances, as being the ministers of almighty God, and bearing his forme: and not seeke any more then that, which belongeth to our degree and vocation. Thus farre the Emperour Basill.

And

And now dare I remitt the matter to M. Maſons owne iudgment, whether this Emperour chalenged vnto himſelf, the ſupremacy in eccleſiaſticall cauſes, as he would haue him, vpon an argument patched togeather of diuers peeces, as we haue ſeene before. But peraduenture he was perſuaded to vſe this argument, by the authority of *Tortura Torti*, to whom in the margent he referreth the reader with this note: *vide Torturam Torti pag.* 349. Where indeede he hath it, but with how ſmall reaſon, may appeare by that, which is already ſaid.

5. *As Baſill* (ſaith M. Maſon.) *did chalenge this gouernment, no man reſiſting him, ſo ſundry Synods haue giuen the like to Princes refuſing it. There was a councell holden at Mentz in Germany, the yeare* 814. *in the time of the Emperour Charles the great, and Pope Leo the third, the Synodicall acts whereof Binnius profeſſeth to haue compared with a manuſcript ſent him out of the Emperours library at Vienna. Now the Bishops aſſembled in the Synode began thus*: In the name of the Father, of the ſonne, and of the holy ghoſt. To the moſt glorious and moſt Chriſtian Emperour, Carolus Auguſtus gouernor of the true religion, and defender of the holy church of God &c. *And a litle after*. We giue thankes to God the Father almighty, becauſe he hath geaſted to his holy church, a gouernour ſo Godly &c. *and againe*. *About all theſe points we greatly need your aide, and ſound doctrine, which may both admonish vs continually, and inſtruct vs curteouſly, ſo farr, that ſuch things, which we haue briefly touched beneath in a few chapters, may receiue ſtrength from your authority, if ſo be, that your piety ſhall ſo iudge it worthy, whatſoeuer is found in them worthy to be amended, let your magnificent, and imperiall dignity commaund it to be amended.*

In the yeares 847. *there was holden another Synode at Mentz, in the time of Leo the* 4. *and Lotharius the Emperour, where the Bishops in like manner*. To our moſt gratious Lord and Chriſtian King Lodowike, the moſt puiſſant gouernor of true religion. *The like was aſcribed to King Receſuinthus, in a councell holden at Emerita in Portugale, about the yeare* 705. *in theſe words*. Whoſe vigilance doth gouerne both ſecular things with greateſt piety, and Eccleſiaſticall by his wiſdome plentifully giuen him by God. *So they acknowledged him gouernour both in cauſes ſecular, and Eccleſiaſticall. This councell of Emerita receiued much ſtrength, and authority from Pope Innocent* 3. *in his epiſtle to Peter Archb. of Compoſtella, as witneſſeth Garſias*

Binn. to. 3. *Pag.* 631.

Binn. tom. 2. *Pag.* 1183.

Garſias in notis in Concil. Emeritã

Thus you ſee moſt famous Bishops aſſembled in Synodes haue giuen vnto Princes, ſuch titles as are equiualent to the ſtile annexed, to the Imperiall crowne of his kingdome.

It is more then falſe, that euer any Synode gaue to any temporall Prince, any title equiualent *to ſupreame head, or gouernor of the church, in all cauſes aſwell Spirituall or eccleſiaſticall, as temporall.* Which is now vnlawfully, and ſacrilegiouſly annexed to the crowne of England Neither do theſe authorities alleaged import any ſuch thing.

For omitting that theſe Synodes here alleaged were neither generall, nor with in the firſt Foure, Fiue, or Six hundreth yeares after Chriſt (which conditions the Proteſtants exact in our proofes, and therfore by the law of equity ought to be tied thereunto themſelues) they giue vnto the Emperours no other titles, then rectors of religion, which with due proportion may be giuen vnto men of farr meaner condition, and degree, as to Church wardens, Officialls, and the like, who may be called rectors of religion, (that is of matters pertaining to religion) in their degree. Emperours and Princes are in very deede gouernors of religion in the higheſt degree, that any ſecular or lay perſons can be, that is, to commaund that the decrees, and ordinances of their paſtors, and prelates be obſerued, and to puniſh the tranſgreſſours therof, and the like, but that they haue any power, or authority to determine, iudge, or decide any thing in eccleſiaſticall matters of themſelues, without the ſentence of the eccleſiaſticall iudges, to wit the Biſhops, and prelates of Gods church, is a meere paradox, nouelty, and hereſie, neuer taught, or practiſed in the Chriſtian world before Henry the 8. of England. And this is irreproouably conuinced by the teſtimonies, both of holy ſcripture, Fathers, and Emperours, of the firſt Foure, and Fiue hundreth yeares before alleaged, which M. Maſon wittingly diſſembleth, becauſe they can receiue no anſwere, as his Maieſties words before related euidently ſhew; yea theſe very councels of Mentz, which ſeeme moſt to fauour his purpoſe, do expreſſlie teach the contrarie, not in the epiſtle or preface to the Emperour, where a preciſe forme of words is not alwaies obſerued, but in the Canon it ſelfe, whence the ſence of all councels is to be taken. The firſt Maguntine coun-

cell

cell here cited by M. Maſon hath this Canon. *We will that Bishops haue power to prouide, rule, gouerne and diſpoſe of Eccleſiaſticall things, according to the authority of the Canons: and that the laity in their offices obay the Bishops, to the gouernment of the churches, defence of widowes, and orphanes: and that they be obedient vnto them, to the conſeruation of their Chriſtianity.* Which Canon is repeated word by word, in the ſecond councell of Mentz here cited, but there it is in the ſeauenth place. Can. 8.

Now let M. Maſon himſelfe iudge, whether theſe councels gaue, or intended to giue to the Emperour, the title of ſupreame head, or gouernor of the church in Eccleſiaſticall cauſes.

That which he bringeth of the councell of *Emerita*, is altogether impertinent. For it is not denied, that Kings may gouerne Eccleſiaſticall affaires, in their ranke and order, that is vnder their Paſtors, and Prelates, and by their direction (as perſons of meaner qualitie do) for which this King is commended by the councell. But it is denied, that Kings haue ſupreame power, and gouernment in Eccleſiaſticall cauſes. And this doth the ſame councell teach in theſe words. *Becauſe Epiſtopall power is by Gods diuine grace ordained, in his holy church, it is ſeeming that as he is chiefe in honour, and bounty in his life time, ſo after his death he be not wronged by detraction.* And becauſe M. Maſon for the ſtrengthning of his purpoſe doth adde, that this councell receiued great force, by the epiſtle of Innocentius the 3. (to ſhew him that all his arguments to this purpoſe are like vnto the ſting of a Scorpion, which though moſt poiſonfull, yet neuer hurteth where the Scorpion her ſelfe is bruſed vpon the place) I will relate here the beginning of that epiſtle, that M. Maſon may ſee, that if this apiſtle be of any force with him, as it is moſt worthie to be, his doctrine of the ſupremacie is moſt falſe: thus therfore writeth that learned Pope. Concil. Emerit. can. 17. Bin. tom. 2. Pag. 1181.

Although the body of the church, whereof Chriſt is head be one, and all the faithfull are members, yet be which of Chriſt the rocke is called a Peter (that is a rocke) and of Chriſt the head, is called the head, he being witnes that ſaid, thou ſhalt be called Cephas, which according to one interpretation is expounded the head: becauſe as the fulnes of the ſenſe aboundeth in the head, and ſome part of that fulnes is deriued to the reſt of the members: ſo the reſt (of the Apoſtles) are called to part of the care. Only Peter is aſſumed to the fulnes

of power, to whom as to the head, the more weighty causes of the church are worthily remitted, not so much by constitution of Canons, as by diuine ordination. Let M. Mason, or any other though more partiall, iudge, what force or strength this epistle giueth, to the supremacy of temporall Princes in Ecclesiasticall causes.

Ad Scapulã. Con. Parsen, l. 3.

6. *We might* (saith M. Mason) *adde hereunto the iudgment of other fathers. Tertullian: we reuerence the Emperour as a man next vnto God, and inferiour only to God. Optatus: Aboue the Emperour is none but only God, who made the Emperour. So S. Chrisostome saith, that the Emperour hath no peere vpon earth, and calleth him the head, and crowne of men vpon earth. If he be next vnto God, and inferiour only to God, if none be about him but God only: if he haue no peere vpon earth, as being the head, and crowne of all men vpon earth, then must he needs be supreame head, and gouernour vpon earth, according to the iudgment of the fathers.*

True Sir, so he is in matters meerelie pertaining to ciuill, and politique gouernment, which properlie are earthlie, or vpon the earth: But what is this to your purpose, to prooue him supreame head, iudge, and gouernour of spirituall matters which are from heauen, and aboue the earth? and whither his power reacheth not, as not hauing receiued the keies of the kingdome of heauen, which our Sauiour left to S. Peter, and not vnto Cesar. Therfore all these words of yours are but wind, and quite besides the question: as also are those that follow in this sort.

4. *This is agreeable to the scripture, which testifieth that most godly Kings commaunded both Priests, and high Priests, euen in cases of religion, as was before declared.*

You bring not one instance of any good King, commaunding by his Kinglie power any thing pertaining to religion, which was new, doubtfull, or in controuersie, but only to execute such things, as were euident by the law, according to the interpretation and practise of the church in those times; As for example, that the Priests and Leuits should instruct the people, offer sacrifice, sing in the church, purge the temple of things pertaining, to the worship of false Gods, and the like: which, or the like things are practised by Christian Kings, not only without blame, but with greatest praise. But what is this to the purpose? is this to iudge, or determine in matters of faith, and religion, as supreame head therof? and not rather euidentlie to

follow

follow the iudgment of the church, and her Paſtors in theſe things? If you do not know, that the gouernmẽt of the church in matters of faith, and religion, did not appertaine to the Kings, but to the Prieſts, euen in the old law of the Iewes, you may learne both of the Prophet Malachie, ſaying: *the lips of the Prieſt ſhall keepe knowledge, and from his mouth ſhalt thou take the law, for he is the Angell, or meſſenger of the God of hoſtes:* and alſo of the law it ſelf commaunding, that in all difficult caſes, euen in ciuill matters, and therfore much more in matters of religion, men ſhould recurre to the iudgment of the Prieſts. *If thou perceiue* (ſaith God by Moyſes) *that the iudgment with thee be hard and doubtfull betweene bloud and bloud, cauſe and cauſe, leproſy and leproſy: and that thou ſee that the words of the iudges within thy gates* (that is the particuler iudges) *do vary: ariſe and go vp to the place, which thy Lord thy God ſhall chooſe. And thou ſhalt come to the Prieſts of the Leuiticall ſtocke, and to the iudge, that ſhalbe at that time, and thou ſhalt aske of them: who ſhall ſhew thee the truth of the iudgment. And thou ſhalt do, whatſoeuer they, that are preſidents of the place, which our Lord ſhall chooſe, ſhall ſay, and teach thee according to his lawe: and thou ſhalt follow their ſentence: Neither ſhalt thou decline to the right hand, nor to the left hand. But he that ſhalbe proud, refuſing to abay the commaundement of the Prieſt, which at that time miniſtreth to our Lord thy God, and decree of the iudge, that man ſhall dye.* Malachie 2. Denteron. 17.8 &c.

8. *Neither is this authority* (ſaith M. Maſon) *taken away in the new teſtament, but continueth the very ſame: as may appeare by S. Paul, who liſteth vp his voice like a trumpet, proclaiming: Let euery ſoule be ſubiect to the higher powers, which words* (*euery ſoule*) *comprehend all perſons both Eccleſiaſticall, and temporall, yea though they were Euangeliſts, Prophets, or Apoſtles, as S. Chriſoſtome doth truly expound them. If euery ſoule be ſubiect vnto higher powers, then the Prince is ſuperiour to all, and conſequently ſupreame within his owne dominions.* M. Maſon.

I will not aſcribe it to want of iudgment in M. Maſon, that he bringeth alwaies arguments againſt himſelfe: but to the nature of the cauſe he maintaineth, which being naught, can haue no good grounds to be ſuſtained by. He bringeth and with good reaſon S. Pauls commaundement, for the ſubiection of all men to higher power.

But what will he inferre hereupon for the Princes ſupremacie?

cie? Marie that *the Prince is supreame superiour within his owne dominions.* But what in spirituall causes? Surelie he must meane so, or els his argument concludeth nothing against any one, vnles it be against some of his holy, and hot spirited brotherhood, that hold themselues to be made free by Christ, from all such subiection as S. Paul speaketh of here. But he disputeth not here against them, but against Catholiques, who, as he knoweth, teach obedience, and subiection to temporall Princes, in all ciuill and temporall causes: therfore must he needs meane superioritie in spirituall causes. In which sense it is euidentlie concluded, out of this authoritie of S. Paul, that temporall Princes are not supreame heads, or gouernors of the church, by this argument.

The Princes, whom S. Paul commaundeth the Christians of his time to obay, had the same, or as great authoritie ouer their Christian subiects, as Christian Princes now haue ouer their subiects, considered only as they are temporall Princes: But those Princes being Pagans had no authoritie ouer their Christian subiects, in matter of faith, and religion. Therfore Christian Princes now, for so much only as they are temporall Princes, haue no such authoritie ouer their subiects.

What M. Mason. will say to this argument, wherof he himselfe furnished the matter, I know not; but well I wot that he will not easilie shape any probable answere to it. Which difficultie besides many others, he either did not, or would not see, when he concluded his paragraffe in this brauing manner.

But why do I stay so long vpon this point, which hath bene of late so learnedly, and plentifully handled, that to say any more, were to cast water into the sea, or to light a candle at noone day.

Where, or by whom this point hath bene either more largelie, or learnedlie handled, then by M. Horne sometime pretended Bishop of Winchester; I know not: who notwithstanding was so encountred by D. Stapleton in his counterblast, that neither he himself, nor any other for him, that I know, haue since appeared in maintainance of that quarrell, but haue left the field to their conquering aduersarie. And if any one since haue said any thing in this point, it hath not bene by way of reply, but a repetition of some of these arguments, which were be-

fore

fore anſwere, vpon aſſurance that the booke being printed welnigh 50. yeares agone, and neither ther publiquelie ſold, but as other Catholique bookes in the vulgar tongue are, is long ſince laid out of mens hands, and now either not knowne, or not found. And therfore M. Maſon thinking himſelfe in this diſpute to be ſailing at maine ſeas, when he is but wading in a brooke not ankle deepe, is no leſſe deceiued then he was, that comming in the night time out of a darke lane into Cheapſide, where he ſawe the moone shyne bright, thought he had bene neere vpon Thames, and called hard, oares, oares.

9. Hauing thus farre brought ſuch proofes, for the temporall Princes ſupremacie, as he thinketh to add any more therunto, should be to caſt water into the ſea: (all which notwithſtanding do either make againſt him, or nothing for him, as appeareth by the anſweres therunto) he beginneth to anſwere ſuch obiections, as he maketh againſt himſelfe, wherin he sheweth no leſſe the weaknes of his cauſe, then he did in arguing for it. For he neither bringeth the moſt preſſing arguments, which make for the Catholique doctrine in this point, (ſome part wherof haue bene touched before) neither doth he propoſe thoſe he bringeth, to their moſt aduantage, neither doth he (which is worſt of all) ſatisfie them as they are propoſed. The firſt obiection he maketh thus. Pag. 117.

If the Prince be ſupreame gouernor in cauſes ſpirituall, he may commaund what religion he liſt, and we muſt obay him.

This argument should be thus propoſed. *If the temporall Prince be ſupreame gouernour in ſpirituall cauſes, his ſubiects are bound to obay his commaundements therin, for euery ſubiect is bound to obay his ſuperiour in that, wherin he is his ſuperiour according to S. Paul: Let euery ſoule be ſubiect to ſuperiour powers. But he may commaund that, which is falſe and pernicious, as many temporall Princes are knowne to haue done, and no maruell for all men of themſelues are ſubiect to errour, as the ſcripture teſtifieth, ſaying that all men are liars, vnles they be freed from that defect, by the ſpeciall aſſiſtance of the holy Ghoſt, which in the gouernment of ſpirituall cauſes, is no where promiſed to temporall Princes. Therfore if the Prince be ſupreame gouernour in ſpirituall cauſes, his ſubiects may be bound to do that, which is falſe and pernitious. Which notwithſtanding is moſt abſurd.* To this argument thus propoſed, I do not ſee what probable anſwere M. Maſon would frame, but let vs ſee how he anſwereth it, as he himſelf propoſeth it. *Pſalm. 115. 11. Rom. 3. 4.*

Not so (saith he) for he is supreame gouernour in causes temporall, yet he may not comaund a man to beare false witnes, or to condemne the innocent as Iesabell did: or if he should, we must rather obay God then man: so in cases of religion: Nabuchodonozor had no warrant to erect his image, nor Ieroboam to set vp his golden calues. For the King as King, is supreame vnder God, not against God; to commaund for truth, not against truth. And if he shall commaund vngodly things, we may not performe obedience, but submit our selues to his punishment with patience.

Yeu do not satisfie M. Mason. For yon giue no rule, nor can you giue any, how to know, when the King in matter of doubt, and controuersie commaundeth for God, or for the truth, and when he commaundeth against God, and the truth. For example, the King of England forbiddeth in his kingdome the Masse, and all other rites and articles of religion, wherin the Protestantes differ from the Catholiques: the King of France commaundeth, and alloweth them all in his kingdome. I would now vnderstād of you M. Mason, how either English or French men may in your doctrine know, whether of these two Kings commaundeth for God and the truth, and whether of them commaundeth against God and the truth. For seeing they cōmaund contrarie things, thone of them at least must necessarilie commaund against God or how he knoweth that K. Henry the 8. commaundeth against God and the truth in commaunding the obseruance of the six articles. So directly opposit to their religion: but for the truth when he commaunded himself to be called supream head of the church contrarie to all Catholique doctrin. You will I doubt not according to your accustomed manner, recurre to the written word and say, that he that commaundeth according to the word, commaundeth for God and the truth. But this is but losse of time, for we are no nearer to know the truth then before; the question and doubt yet remaining, whether of these Kings commaunde according to the written word, which how to know I would Learne some rule of you. For seeing that in your doctrine, they are both supreame gouernors in these matters, within their owne dominions, and both of them pretend to commaund according to Gods word, it seemeth to me, that in your doctrine both their subiects are bound to obay them, and yet this is manifestlie absurd, seeing that thone of them at the least commaunderh against God and his

his truth. I will attend your ſatisfaction M. Maſon in this point, which vntill you giue, I ſhall promiſe you to eſteeme your doctrine, of the ſupremacie of temporall Princes in ſpirituall matters, not only an hereſie in matter of faith, but an abſurd Paradox euen in politike principles, as diuiding Princes one from thother in religion, wherin they ought moſt to agree, and tying their ſubiects either to obay them in matters hurtfull to their ſoules, or for feare of that to diſobay them, in matters pertaining to their duty: And to giue them power to iudg when their Prince commaundeth for God or againſt God and therby to open the dore to all rebellion and ſedition.

10. The ſecond obiection M. Maſon propoſeth in this ſort. *If the ſupreame gouernment in ſpirituall cauſes be due to the imperiall crowne, it skilleth not, whether the Prince be man or woman, woman or child, nor of what religion. For the princely power was no leſſe in Traiane, then in Theodoſius, in King Henry, then Q. Mary, in Queene Mary the enemy of the new Goſpellers, then in Q. Elizabeth their protectrix: Yea it was no leſſe in King Lucius before he was baptiſed, then after. And conſequently the Emperour of the Turkes may be called ſupreame gouernour, in cauſes Eccleſiaſticall within his owne dominions.*

The force of this argument would more euidentlie appeare, if M. Maſon had thus propoſed it *If it belong to the Imperiall crowne, to be ſupreame gouernor of the church of Chriſt, euen in ſpirituall cauſes, it will neceſſarily follow, that Turkiſh and Pagan princes are ſo alſo. But this is very falſe and abſurd. For no man can be head of that body, whereof he is not a member: But Turkes and Pagans are not members of Chriſt his church, as is euident; they therfore cannot be heads, nor ſupreame gouernours therof in thoſe cauſe, which, as it is Chriſts church, doth appertaine vnto it.* But let vs ſee his anſwere to it, as it is propoſed by himſelfe.

Heere are two things (ſaith he) *to be conſidered, Firſt, the princely power and authority: Secondly the habilitie, rightly to exerciſe the ſame. The princely power is giuen immediatly from God, both vnto Chriſtian Princes, and alſo vnto Ethnikes, which are guided only by the light, and law of nature, and by conſtitutions thence deduced by the wit of man. For this is true in all: by me Kings raigne. And Daniel ſaid vnto Nabuchodonoſor. O King thou art a King of Kings, for the God of heauen hath giuen vnto thee a kingdome and power, and ſtrength, and glory. But the habilitie rightly to vſe and exerciſe this authority, by referring it vnto the true end, that is the glory of God, (for all our riuers ought to runn into that* Prouerbs 8.15. Dan. 2.37.

Ocean) and the eternall good of the ſubiects, is communicated from the Lord only to ſuch, as know him in Chriſt Ieſus, and are guided by his grace.

Note diligent reader, that M. Maſon putteth here a diſtinction betweene the princelie power, and the habilitie rightlie to vſe it: and therfore cannot deny the ſame diſtinction in Epiſcopall power, wherupon it followeth that a man may be a true Bishop, and yet cannot make a lawfull Bishop, becauſe he wanteth abilitie to exerciſe his power, as it happeneth in heretiques, ſchiſmatiques, and excommunicate perſons. Which diſtinction obſerued, will ſhew the Bishops now in England to be no lawfull Bishops, (though they did deſcend from Cranmer by true conſecration as they do not) for want of habilitie in him, that did conſecrate them, to exerciſe rightly that power, as is before mentioned.

Rom. 13.1. De ciuit. l. 5. c. 21. So the domination and power that mans reaſons hath ouer his ſenſes and gifts either of natur or fortune is of nature, but the right vſe thereof is frō greund. But what then? will follow hereupō that human hath ſupreame power in matters of faith and religion?

The fountaine therfore of all power is God himſelf: as the Apoſtle witneſſeth, ſaying: there is no power but of God. To which purpoſe it is well ſaid of S. Auſtin. He that gaue it to Marke, gaue it to Ceſar, he that gaue it to Auguſtus, gaue it to Nero: he that gaue it to Veſpaſian father, or his ſonne moſt ſweet Emperours, gaue it alſo to Domitian the moſt cruell. And that I may not reckon vp the reſt in particuler, he that gaue it to Conſtantine the Chriſtian, gaue it alſo to Iulian the Apoſtata. But though domination, and power were from the law of nature, yet the right vſe of it is not from nature, but from grace. A Prince as a Prince be he good or bad, in reſpect of princely calling hath ſufficient power, and authority to gouerne his people, according to the will of God. And it is his duty ſo to doe. The Lord ſaid vnto Cyrus, I will go before thee, and make the crooked ſtreight. I will breake the brazen doores, and burſt the iron barres. And I will giue thee treaſures of darknes, and the things hid in ſecret places, that thou maiſt know that I am the Lord. Vpon which words S. Hierome noteth, that God giueth kingdomes vnto wicked men, not that they ſhould abuſe them, but as for other reaſons, ſo for this, that being inuited by his bounty they ſhould be conuerted from their ſins. So it is their duty to ſerue God, not only as they are men, but as they are Kings. And Kings (ſaith S. Auſtin) do in this ſerue God as Kings, when they do thoſe things to ſerue him, which none but Kings can do. But what is that? It may appeare by theſe words. Let the Kings of the earth ſerue Chriſt, euen by making lawes for Chriſt. For though the immediate end of humane ſocieties be

Iſay. 45.2.3. Epiſt. 50. Epiſt. 50.

be peace, and proſperity, yet the laſt end of all, and moſt principally to be reſpected, is the glory of God, and eternall happines. For which purpoſe it is the duty of all ſubiects, to praie for their Prince, though he be a pagan, that vnder him they may liue a Godly, and peaceable life, in all Godlines and honeſty. But though euery Prince, in that he is a Prince, hath authority to ſerue God as a Prince, yet for the due execution of it, there is required grace. Authority is in a Pagan: the due execution requireth a Chriſtian. The King of Niniue had authority long before, to proclaime a faſt: Nabuchodonoſor had authority to commaund, that all nations ſhould worship the God of Daniell: but they put it not in execution, till God touched their hearts: and when they put it in execution, it was not by any new authority, but by vertue of their former Princely power hertofore abuſed, but now vſed rightly by direction of Gods ſpirit and aſſiſtaunce of his grace.

So the laſt end of all humaine actions is Gods glory. But what will follow hereupō for the ſupremacy.

1. ad Timoth. 2.

So euery artificer in that he is ſuch an one, hath power to ſerue God as ſuch an one yet for the due execution of it, grace is required and yet by his art is not he ſupreme head of the church I howbeit notwithſtand would folow in M. Maſons doctrin.

I confeſſe it was very irkſome vnto me, to make relation of all this longe and looſe diſcourſe, containing nothing to the purpoſe for the matter in hand. For the moſt that is here ſaid, is that Kings as Kings, haue power to make lawes for the ſeruice of Chriſt, which is not denied (ſuppoſing they do it according to the iudgment, of the paſtors of Gods church.) But this is Farre from that, which M. Maſon hath here to ſhew, which is to prooue that Kings as Kings, and therfore aſwell Pagan and infidell, as Chriſtian Kings, haue ſupreme and ſoueraigne authority, in eccleſiaſticall and Spirituall matters and cauſes. A propoſition, which (as I thinke) hath no author but M Maſon, nor any other ground but his fancy, ſtraitened by the force of the obiection, made againſt his doctrine of the ſupremacy of temporall Princes, which he, finding no other meane to maintaine, is forced to ſett abroach this palpable abſurdity. When M. Maſon ſhall haue prooued this paradox, of the ſoueraigne power of Pagan Princes ouer Chriſts church, by ſome other ground then his owne ſenſeles aſſertion, we will diſpute with him, whether the diſtinction of the power it ſelfe, and the meanes to exerciſe it, be appliable to that purpoſe, for which he vſeth it, or no.

In the meane while I will let him ſee, how dangerous this his doctrine, and diſtinction is to all eſtates, and how it openeth the waie to all ſedition. For by it maie he, or anie other, maintaine himſelfe to be King of England, or anie other Kingdome, Saying that as he is the ſonne of his Father (be he whom he

will (he hath power from God to gouerne the Kingdome, and wanteth only hability to exercise that power, and to rule as King, and therfore if he should now begin to raigne, he should not do it by vertue of anie new power graunted him, but by vertue of the same power he had before. If he, or anie man els should argue in this sort, he would (I doubt not) be quicklie lodged in the place appointed for crackt wits, till he should grow more wise. The fault that M. Mason would find in this discourse will let him see the like in his owne, that he may med it, if he will.

we builde not our faith vpō Popes, councels, nor Fathers, but only vpon the sacred Word of God registred in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets saith he pa. 101, Cap 15. n. 7. 1. Cor. 5. 12.

And seeing he giueth vs no kind of proofe of this new paradoxe: that Pagan Princes haue soueraigne authority ouer Christs church, in Spirituall matters, and want only meanes to execute it, but will haue vs to beleeue it vpon his bare word, though he exact of vs, for proofe of whatsoeuer we affirme, expresse scripture, and thinketh he is not well dealt with, if we giue him the testimonies of Fathers, and councels, of which vnequall dealing I more often, and willingly putt him in mind, becaus I see it often vsed both by himself, and his reforming brethren. Seeing (I say) he will giue vs no proofe for this his assertion, I will (to the proofes of the contrary before alleadged, aswell out of scripture, antiquity, and reason) add one other deduced out of the doctrine of S. Paul, who saith expresly, *that he hath no power to iudge of those, that are without (that is) that are not any way within the church, which is the house of God, and body of Christ.* Wherupon it followeth and by greater reason, that those that are without the church, as all Pagans euidently are, haue no power to iudge, either those persons or causes, that are within the church. But M. Mason to make his new doctrine more currant explicateth the same in this sort.

Mala. 2. 7. How he argueth against him self? For if God hath made priests the messegers of his truth he hath not giuen the same auctority to Princes.

The truth of this answere, that thou maist see in another glasse, let vs a litle remoue our speech from the Prince to the priest: I demaund therfore if the Priests, the sons of Aaron were not the messengers of the Lord of hostes: Yes verely as saith Malachy. But he may be a false prophet, an idolater, an Apostata, he may turne Pagan, or Atheist. Is such a Priest the messenger of the Lord of hostes? A priest as a priest, be he good or bad, in respect of his priestly calling, and authority, is the messenger of the Lord of hostes: he ought to leaue his impieties in seducing the people, and to serue God in teaching the truth. In that he is a priest, God hath armed him with a calling to deliuer his

message,

message, for personnance wherof, he needeth no new calling, but grace to vse that well, which before he abused. Apply this to the present point, and it will satisfie.

Good God, how blind and peruerse is heresie, which being to maintaine it self without the grounds of Catholique doctrine, doth notwithstanding obstinately impugne the same? This I say because, vnles M. Mason suppose as true, the Catholique doctrine of an indeleble character in Christian preiesthood, wherby the power of order once receiued doth alwaies remaine, this his discourse is altogether vaine and idle (I speake here of Christian preiesthood, and not of that of Aaron, which descended by the line of generation.) For without some such meanes to conserue the power of order, it is not possible to cōceiue how the lawfullty therof being lost by excommunication, heresie, apostacy, or the like, it can anie waies be renewed or repaired without a new ordination, which M. Mason approoueth not. And therfore this example of priesthood, vnles he suppose the Catholique doctrine, doth make nothing for his purpose, which is to shew how temporall Princes may haue supreame power, in Spirituall affaires, though they haue not the true or lawfull vse therof.

Secondly, though M. Mason should be permitted to make vse for his owne aduantage of the Catholique doctrine in this particuler, yet will it not anie waie helpe him, vnles he cā first shew, that temporall Princes, eo ipso, that they are Princes, haue souereigne power in Spirituall causes, and then that they haue some character, or some other thing, by meanes wherof the same power is conserued in them, though they haue not the lawfull vse therof. But how M. Mason can make anie probable proofe of either of these points, it surpasseth my small capacitie to conceiue He doth therfore in this whole loose discourse of his, miserably and vnlearnedly begge the graunt of that, which is in question: to wit, that temporall Princes haue from God supreame authority in Spirituall things: Which vnles it be graunted him (and yet it is that wherupon we dispute) all these words of his are but wind, and may serue him as a glasse, to see the impertinency of his former answerein.

It is a different thing to say, that tēporall Princes are supreā heads in all Spirituall causes and things: and to say that they ought to referr all their Princely actions to Gods glory the first is that M. Mason should prooue the later noe mā denieth.

The third obiection M. Mason setteth downe thus. *To make Mason*

the

the Prince ſupreame head, or gouernour of the church is vnnaturall, for did the sheepe feede the flocke? he would haue ſaid I thinke the shepheard at leaſt ſo he ſhould haue ſaid) *or the ſonne guide the Father?* His anſwere is this.

As the Prieſt is Father, and shepheard in reſpect of the Prince, ſo the Prince
Pſal. 78. 70. *is a shepheard and Father, in reſpect of the prieſt. The Lord choſe Dauid his ſeruant, and tooke him from the sheepfoldes, to feede his people in Iacob, and his inheritance in Iſrael. So he fed them in the ſimplicity of his hart, and gui-*
2. Chron. 29. 11. *ded them by the diſcretion of his hands. And Ezechias called the prieſts his ſons. If the Prince be their shepheard, then he muſt feede them, if he be their Father, then he muſt guide them, this is naturall.*

The force of truth is great, and alwaies victorious M. Maſon after all his wrágling, is at laſt conſtrained to confeſſe that Princes are sheepe, and children in reſpect of prieſts, and therfore by the very order of nature, to be fedd and guided by them: not in temporall matters (for in thoſe he ſaith the Princes are their shepheards, and Fathers) therfore in Spirituall things, vnles he will that one and the ſame perſō maie be sheepe, and shepheard, ſuperior and ſubiect to another, in reſpect of one and the ſame matter, which no man of common ſenſe will thinke. Is it not therfore euen by his owne concluſion moſt cleare, that by the courſe of nature Princes are to be fedd, and guided by the prieſts in Spirituall things? and conſequently, that Princes are not, nor can be ſupreame gouernors, or heads of the church in the ſame.

12. Hitherto haue I deferred to anſwere that maine argument of M. Maſons, in vrging wherof he emploieth Six, or ſeauen whole pages of his booke in folio, thinking it of principall force, for the concluding of his purpoſe, which is to proue the depoſition, of the Catholique Biſhops by Q. Elizabeah to haue bene iuſt and lawfull. I haue (I ſaie) hitherto differed to anſwere it, becauſe though it appeare to M. Maſon of great force, yet is it indeed altogether impertinent to his purpoſe, as ſhall appeare by the anſwere.

3. Reg. 2. 27. The argument in briefe is this. *King Salomon depoſed Abiather being high prieſt, and put another in his place. Therfore Q. Elizabeth might do the like by the Biſhops of her kingdome.*

Wherunto I anſwere, that though it ſhould be graunted, that Salomon as King only and not as a prophet and therefore by ſpeciall

speciall reuelation deposed Abiather: and Farther that his fact was iust, and lawfull (which two things M. Mason cannot easely prooue) yet doth not this argument conclude any thing for M. Masons purpose. For though it were also graunted, that the priests of the old law were subiect, in all temporall causes to the iudgmēt of their Kings, yet it doth not follow therupō, that the priest of the new law are in like manner subiect to their Kings. For noe true Christian can deny, but that the preiesthood of the new lawe, is both different, and also more perfect, then that of the old, whereas the power of the Kings is the same in both. And this is more then sufficient, to hinder the necessary sequell of the argument proposed, in the iudgment of any one that hath anie iudgment.

But yet Farther, be it that the priests of the new, and old law are equall in this respect, (which M. Mason will neuer be able to prooue) yet doth M. Masons argument conclude nothing at all for his purpose. For Abiathers case was farre different from that of our Catholique Bishops: his cause being meerely temporall, to wit his conspiring against Salomon in fauour of his brother Adonias, which cause had it not bene in the person of a priest, should without all question haue belonged to the tēporall tribunall to be iudged. But theirs was a matter of faith, and religion, which though it had not bene in the person of priests, yet could it not haue bene iudged by a temporall iudge. And so M. Masons maine argument is shewed to be most impertinent for his purpose, yea it may be retorted against him in this sort. Neither Salomon, nor any other good King euer iudged, the priests of the old law in matters of faith and religion, but were subiect to their iudgmēt therin, as is manifest by the example of Saul and Ozias: therfore much lesse can temporall Kings iudge, the priests of the new law in the like matters. Aand this whole matter I will prooue by the ineuitable testimony of his Maiesty, to whose authority M. Mason, I suppose, will readily submitt his iudgmēt: thus therfore his Maiesty writeth.

13. *I confesse, that when a Prince commaundeth any thing directly against the word of God, and which tendeth to the subuersion of religion, that the clergy in this case ought not only to dispence with his subiects in their obedience to him, but ought expresly to forbid them to obay him, because we ought rather to obay God, then men.*

In his declaratiō against Cardinall de peron page 170. impressiō of paris.

And because there may be difficulty to know when the Prince commaundeth any thing directly against Gods word, and to the subuersion of religion, no Prince being so malitiously wicked, as to commaund anie thing that he knoweth, and cõfesseth to be such, his Maiesty declareth how this may be knowne, and who ought to iudge therof, denying first that this iudgment pertaineth to Princes in these words.

It is true, that the Emperours neuer vaunted themselues to be soueraigne iudges in points of faith, and doctrine. And then he telleth who are cõpetent iudges in these matters, saying. *I confesse that it is a point of diuinity to iudge, how farre the keies doth reach, and that the clergy may, and ought giue their cẽsures against Princes, that contrary to their oath make warre against* Iesus Christ, *without making laymen iudges therof.*

By all which it is plaine, that in his Maiesties iudgmẽt, the clergy hath soueraigne power ouer Princes, in points of faith, doctrine, and diuinity, and that they may iudge and censure them therin indepẽdentlie of the laitie: euen so farr as expresly to forbid their subiects to obaie thẽ, in case they commaund any thing cõtrarie to Gods word, and to the subuersion of religion, which, when it happeneth, belongeth vnto the cleargy to iudge, as a matter of faith, and doctrine, and not to the temporall Princes, who are not iudges in those points. Wherby M. Mason may see, how farr he differeth from his Maiestie, in this point of temporall Princes supremacy, in Spirituall matters, and causes.

How the oath of supremacy doth aggree with the protestãtes doctrin see the last capt. of thu treatise.

Therfore to conclude this point, I saie that the oath of supremacy, wherby the title of supreame head, or gouernour of the church in all Spirituall causes, and things is giuen to temporall Princes, being Sacrilegious and wicked, as cõtrary to holy Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, and the practise of all Christian Princes, since the first foundation of Christianity, as hath bene already shewed, and therfore such (as his maiesty saith) as being cõmaunded by the Prince, may and ought to be expresly forbidden by the cleargy, who in that case is to be obaied by all the Princes subiects, the refusall therof by the Catholique Bishops could not be anie act of disloialty, nor any iust cause of their depositiõ, or depriuatiõ, and cõsequẽtly they who vpõ this only cause were thrust into their places could not be lawfully inuested therin, but must necessarily be vnlawfull vsurpers, and intruders, and therfore no lawfull Bishops.

The

The ſeauenteenth Chapter.

Thoſe that ſucceeded M. Parker, and the reſt in the places of Biſhops, downe to this preſent daie, neither were nor are true, and lawfull Biſhops.

I Comprehend all thoſe that ſucceeded M. Parker, and the reſt that were firſt intruded into the places of the Catholique Biſhops, euen till this daie in one queſtion, becauſe their caſe is not different. Wherin it is cleare, that the ſame defects, which haue bene found in any of their predeceſſors ſince M. Cranmer (except that of intruſion ſpecified in the chapter going before) are alſo in the ſame degree in theſe, of whom the preſent queſtion is propoſed: and therfore the difficultie here is not of thoſe defects: but whether there be not ſome other in theſe, which was not in thothers.

1. The reſolution is, that they haue a defect ſo eſſentiall, or materiall (more then thothers had) that it alone is ſufficient to make them no Biſhops. And this is that they were not, or are not prieſts. So that their calling is defectiue, not only in reſpect of the callers, and calling, as that of the others was, but alſo in reſpect of the perſons.

That prieſthood is neceſſarily, and eſſentially preſuppoſed to epiſcopall order, and power in ſuch ſort, as he that is not prieſt cannot be Biſhop, I find it not doubted of by anie of our aduerſaries, neither can there be any doubt therof. For it is no where found either in holy ſcripture, or eccleſiaſticall hiſtory, that any one was Biſhop, that was not alſo prieſt, and therfore Biſhops are ordinarily called prieſts, becauſe all Biſhops are indeed prieſts; though all prieſts be not Biſhops, as hath bene ſhewed before. *No man can be Biſhop, that is high prieſt vnles he be prieſt.*

The Catholique councell of Sardis doth admire and withall condemne the impudency of the Arrians, accuſors of S. Athanaſius, for vſing the teſtimonie of one as a Biſhop, who was not ſo much as a prieſt. *They gaue to him* (ſaith the councell) the

Athanaſ. Apol. 2. in epiſt. Sardic. ante med. Theod. l. 2. cap. 8. ante med.

the title of Bishop, that was not ſo much as prieſt. And againe, *They brought forth him for witnes as Bishop, which was not prieſt.* And yet againe. *They named him Bishop, which was not as yet made prieſt.* This is ſo certaine with M. Field, that herupon he would proove euery prieſt, or presbyter (as he calleth them, to auoide the conſequence which the very word inferreth) to haue the ſame authority with Bishops, and that only for orders ſake, the diſtinction is made betwixt them, which doctrine although falſe in it ſelfe, as hath bene shewed before, yet doth it manifeſtly ſuppoſe, that prieſthood is ſo neceſſarily required to epiſcopall order, or power, that none can be Bishop vnles he be Priest.

D. Field of the church l. 3. c. 39. ante med.

The ſtate of the queſtion.

This ground therfore being agreed vpon by all parties: the preſent controuerſie reſteth in this only point: Whether the prieſthood of the new law doth include in it the power to offer ſacrifice vnto God, not only of praier, praiſe, or thankeſgiuing, but a true, proper, and externall ſacrifice, as the prieſts of the old law, or rather as our ſauiour Christ offered to his Father? or no? If it be prooued, that the prieſthood of the new law eſſentially includeth in it ſuch a power, it will inuincibly follow, firſt, that the new miniſtery of the pretended reformation, as well in England, as elſwhere, (diſclayming from all ſuch power, as from Antichriſtian idolatry) hath no true prieſthood: and thence will it as cuidently follow that they haue no true Bishops and paſtors, which is that I intend here to proove.

That this diſputation maie proceede with ſome order, I will firſt proove by the teſtimonie of holy ſcriptures, interpreted by the Fathers of the firſt fiue hundreth yeares, that there is in the church of Christ a ſacrificing prieſthood, not alwaies to offer externall, and ſenſible ſacrifice to God, no leſſe trulie and properly, then in the law of Moiſes. Secondly, I will anſwere the chiefeſt obiections againſt the ſame. Thirdlie, I will infer thereupon that, which is chiefliе intended in this diſpute.

In the firſt point I will not multiplie manie teſtimonies of holie ſcriptures, but will bring only two, or three at the moſt, with the ancient Fathers interpretations, which ſhalbe ſufficient to perſuade anie vnderſtanding, not (wilfullie) tied to his owne errour, of which kinde of

persons it was said long since, and most truly, *that they may be ouercome, but they can neuer be perswaded.*

2. The first testimonie shalbe our Sauiour Christ his owne act, and institution recorded by S. Luke, and S. Paul in these words. *This is my body which is giuen for you. Do this for a commemoration of mee. This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye as often as ye shall drinke: for the commemoration of mee.* Heere our Sauiour gaue into his Apostles, and to all those that succeede them in the office of priesthood charge, and withall authoritie, and power to do the same thing that he then did, as is manifest by these words *do ye this.* And therfore (to prooue, that he instituted, and ordained in his church a sacrificing power of priesthood) it remaineth only to prooue, that he did then offer sacrifice himselfe. Which I proue in this sort. Our Sauiour Christ was Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, God himselfe hauing sworne so: and therfore was he at some time to offer sacrifice (the proper action of priesthood) in the same forme and rite, that Melchisedech offered in, for otherwaies he neither could haue bene said, or knowne to haue bene so particularlie a Priest of that order. But vnles he sacrificed in his last supper, when he gaue his body and blood to his disciples, vnder the forme of bread and wine, he neuer sacrificed in that forme and rite, that Melchisedech sacrificed in, (for his sacrifice was in bread, and wine) Therfore is it necessarie that he then did truly sacrifice. The whole difficultie of this argument is reduced to this point; whether Melchisedech offered in bread and wine, as the peculier offering of his order and priesthood, or no: for this being prooued, the rest is cleare.

S Hierom. contra Luciferianos in fine. *Luke 22. 19.* *1. Corinth. 11. 25.* *Psal. 109. 4.* *Hebre. 5. 6.*

And that the proper, and peculiar offering of Melchisedech his priesthood was in bread and wine, no man that beleeueth the holy scriptures, interpreted by vncorrupt antiquitie, can make doubt. The scripture saith thus *But Melchisedech bringing forth bread and wine, for he was Priest of God most high.* Wherupon the most auncient fathers do teach without controllment, or contradiction, that Melchisedech being the Priest of God, did there offer sacrifice of bread and wine, in figure of that, which our Sauiour in his last supper offered.

Gen. 14. 18.

Epist. 63. ad Cecilianum.

Item in sacerdote Melchisedech sacrificij Dominici sacramentum præfiguratum videmus, secundum quod scriptura diuina testatur & dicit: Et Melchisedech rex Salem protulit panem & vinum. Fuit autem sacerdos Dei summi & benedixit Abraham. Quod autem Melchisedech typum Christi portaret: declarat in Psalmis Spiritus Sanctus ex persona Patris ad Filium dicens: Ante Luciferum genui te: tu es sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech. Qui ordo vtique hic est de sacrificio illo veniens & inde descendens; quod Melchisedech sacerdos Dei summi fuit, quod panem & vinum obtulit, quod Abrahã benedixit. Nam quis magis sacerdos Dei summi, quam Dominus noster Iesus Christus? qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est panem & vinum, suum scilicet corpus & sanguinem.

S. Cipriã that holy Bishop and martir, who liued in the third hundreth yeare after Christ that is aboue thirteene hũdreth yeares agoe, saith thus. *We see the mystery of our Lords sacrifice, prefigured by Melchisedech the priest, as the holy scripture witnesseth, & saith. And Melchisedech the King of Salem brought forth bread and wine, for he was priest of God most high, and blessed Abraham. And that Melchisedech bare the figure of Christ, the holy Ghost declareth in the Psalmes, saying in the perso of the father to the sonne: I haue begot thee before the day starre: Our Lord hath sworne and it shall not repent him: Thou art a Priest for euer according to the order of Melchisedech: which order doubtles hath it beginning frõ that sacrifice, and thence descended, that Melchisedech was the priest of the most high God, that he offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is rather the priest of God most high, then our Lord Iesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to God the father, and offered the same that Melchisedech had offered, that is bread and wine,*

Yt

Vt ergo in Genesi per Melchisedech sacerdotem benedictio circa Abraham posset ritè celebrari, præcedit antè imago sacrificij Christi in pane & vino scilicet constituta, quam rem perficiens & adimplens Dominus panem & Calicem mixtum vino obtulit, & qui est plenitudo, veritatem præfiguratæ imaginis adimpleuit.

to wit his body and bloud. And he addeth. *Therfore as the figure of the sacrifice in bread, and wine wēt before in Genesis, that the blessing of Abrahā might be rightly performed by Melchisedech the priest, which thing our Lord perfecting, and fulfilling offered bread, and the Chalice mixt with wine, and he who is the fulnes, and perfection, fulfilled the truth of the prefigured signe or image.* Ibidem.

VVhat can our nevv maisters say to this? Surelie nothing but that S. Ciprian vvas a papist, teaching the sacrifice of the body and bloud of Christ, vnder the formes of bread and vvine, vvherin the sacrifice and order of Melchisedech, consisted according to vvhose order our Sauiour vvas priest, differing in this notvvithstanding, that Christ and his sacrifice vvas the truth prefigured, Melchisedech and his sacrifice the figure.

Iurauit Dominus, & non pænitebit eum; quibus verbis immutabile futurum esse significat, quod adiungit, Tu es sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinē Melchisedech: ex eo quod iam nusquam est sacerdotium & sacrificium secundum ordinem Aaron, & vbique offertur sub sacerdote Chri-

S. Augustin another Africā Doctor teacheth the same saying. *By these words, our Lord hath sworne, and it shall not repēt him, is signified that, that which followeth is immutable; thou art a priest for euer according to the order of Melchisedech: for that the priesthood and sacrifice according to the order of Aaron, is now no where, and euery where vnder the* De ciuitat. Dei l. 17. cap. 17.

sto,

sio, quod protulit Melchisedech, quando benedixit Abrahæ, quis ambigere permittitur, de quo istis dicantur?

priest Christ is offered that, which Melchisedech brought forth when he blessed Abraham: who can doubt of whom these things are spooken?

Of this same subiect he hath a large discourse vpon the Psal. 33. conci. 1. vvhich is ouer prolix to be related here S. Ambrose is as plaine, sayiug.

In cap. 5. ad Hebræos.

Huius ordinem sacrificij per mysticam similitudinem Melchisedech iustissimus rex instituit, quando Domino panis & vini fructus obtulit. Constat enim perudum victimas periisse, quæ fuerunt ordinis Aaron, non Melchisedech: sed hoc manere potius institutum, quod toto orbe in sacramentorum erogatione celebratur.

The most iust King Melchisedech did begin the order of the sacrifice by a mysticall similitude, when he offered to our Lord the fruites of bread and wine. For it is euident, that the sacrifices of beasts, which were of the order of Aarō, are ceased, not that of Melchisedech; but that this institutiō doth rather remaine, which is celebrated in the whole world, in the ministring of the sacraments.

Melchisedech rex Salem sacerdos Dei altissimi, qui panem & vinum sanctificatum dedit nutrimentum, in typum Eucharistiæ.

Clemens of Alexādria vvho liued 1400. yeares agoe hath the same doctrine in these fevv, but plaine vvords. *Melchisedech King of Salem priest of God most high who gaue bread and wine, sanctified foode, in figure of the Eucharist.*

And Theodoret vvho liued 1200. yeares agoe testifieth the same yet more clearelie.

4. Stromat. ad finem.

Cæterum Melchisedech non Iudæorum, sed gentium est sacerdos. Sic & Dominus

Melchisedech (saith he) is not priest of the Iewes, but of the gētiles, as also our Sauiour Christ

Christus

Chriſtus non pro Iudæis tantùm, ſed pro omnibus hominibus ſemetipsũ obtulit Deo. Exorditur autem ſacerdotium in nocte, qua crucem ſubiuit, cùm accepit panem, & gratias egit, fregit, & dixit. Accipite & comedite ex ipſo, Hoc eſt corpus meum. Similiter & Calicem cùm temperaſſet, dedit diſcipulis ſuis, dicens, Bibite ex hoc omnes, Hic eſt enim ſanguis meus noui teſtamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remiſſionem peccatorum. Inueniens autem Melchiſedech ſacerdotem, & regem eſſe, (figura igitur erat veri ſacerdotis, & regis) & offerentẽ Deo non ſacrifiia ratione carentia, ſed panem & vinũ.

offered himſelfe to God, not for the Iewes only, but for all men. And he began his prieſthood the night, when he vnderwent the croſſe, when he tooke bread, gaue thankes, brake, and ſaid, take and eate ye of this: For this is my bodie. In like manner when he had mingled the Chalice, he gaue to his diſciples, ſaying, drinke ye all of this. For this is my bloud of the new teſtament, which ſhalbe shed for many for remiſſion of ſins. For we find that Melchiſedech was prieſt, and King (and therfore a figure of the true prieſt and King) offering to God not vnreaſonable ſacrifices, but bread and wine.

But the teſtimony of S Hierome ſetting dovvne not only his ovvue doctrine, but that alſo of his aunceſtors Hypolitus, Irenæus, tvvo Euſebiuſes and Euſtachius, is vvorthy of more ſpeciall note. Epiſt. 126.

Neque ille (Melchiſedech) carnis & ſanguinis victimas immolauerit, & brutorum animalium ſanguinem dextera ſuſceperit, ſed pane & vino ſimplici puroq; ſacrificio, Chriſti dedicauerit ſacramentum.

Neither did he (Melchiſedech) offer ſacrifice of the fleſh and bloud of brute beaſts, but with bread and wine, a ſimple and pure ſacrifice, did he dedicate the ſacrament or miſterie of Chriſt.

3. Notwithſtanding all theſe cleare teſtimonies of vncorrupt, and vnpartiall antiquitie, wherunto might be added many more, if neceſſitie required, for the proofe of Melchiſedech his offering of bread and wine, in ſacrifice M. Maſon in the name of all his brethren reformed ſtoutlie denieth, that euer he offered in theſe kinds, or that our Sauiour Chriſt euer offered in the like. But vpon what ground thinke you, doth he ſo peremptorilie contradict ſuch euident teſtimonies of venerable antiquitie? Surelie vpon no other, then his owne wilfull obſtinacy, that will not permit him to acknowledge the truth. For if all were true, that M. Maſon ſaith for his negatiue, yet would it nothing hinder the truth of that we affirme, as ſhall appeare in euerie particuler of his diſcourſe, which is this.

Lib. 5. cap. 2. pag. 609.

Geneſ. 14 18 *It cannot be gathered out of this text: (And Melchiſedech King of Salem brought forth bread and wine, and he was a prieſt of the moſt high God) that he ſacrificed to God in bread and wine.* a *Ioſephus ſaith, that he gaue entertainment to the ſouldiers of Abraham:* b *Tertullian ſaith, that he offered bread and wine to Abraham, returning from the battell.* c *S. Ambroſe ſaith likewiſe, that Melchiſedech did offer it vnto Abraham.* d *Your owne Andradius ſaith, I wilbe of their opinion which ſay, that Melchiſedech refreshed with bread, and wine the ſouldiers of Abraham, being weary and tired with a long battell.* e *And Cardinall Caietan: Here is nothing ſpoken of the oblation or ſacrifice, but of the proſition and bringing it out, which Ioſephus ſaith was done to refreſh the conquerours.*

a *Antiquit. li 1. c. 11.*
b *Con Iudeos cap. 14.*
c *Lib. 4. de ſacramẽtis cap. 3.*
d *De vulgari editione Lati. lib. 4. Defenſ. pag. 636.*
e *In Geneſ 14*

Be it ſo; what repugnance hath any part of all this, with Melchiſedech his offering of bread, and wine to God in ſacrifice, that M. Maſon ſhould ſo confidentlie or (truer) impudentlie deny it, contrarie to the cleare teſtimonies of ſo many, and ſo great fathers, poſitiuelie affirming it as expreſſed in holy ſcripture? none at all: For he hauing brought forth bread and wine, what might hinder him to offer it firſt to God in ſacrifice, and that done deuide it to Abraham and his ſouldiers for their refreshing? was it euer a whit leſſe fit for their refreshing and nourriture, for being offred to God, and therby ſanctified, or not rather much more fit? The cuſtome and manner aſwell of Iewes as Gentiles, feaſting and banquetting with the ſame meate that was offered in ſacrifice, (wherof I ſuppoſe M. Maſon is not ignorant) doth

shew, that there is no repugnance betwixt Melchisedech his offering to God of bread and wine in sacrifice, and his entertaining, feasting, or refreshing Abraham, and his armie with the same. And that the feasting or entertainment, which Melchisedech made to Abraham, was not of meere friendship or hospitalitie, but a sanctified and holy feast, it is plaine euen by Iosephus the Iew, whom M. Mason citeth, who saith that *Melchisedech made vnto Abraham a holy banquet*, as the Greeke word will without any force beare. But seeing M. Mason maketh force of a Iewes authoritie, against the most auncient Christian Doctors, in a matter pertaining to Gods worship, and true sense or vnderstanding of holy scripture (which to any good Christian may seeme iustly absurd) I will remit him in this point to Philo the Iew, who was not only Iosephus his auncient, but also esteemed of more authoritie by many degrees, aswell for his iudgment, and learning, as for his sincerities in his religion. His words are these. *VVhen that great and principall Bishop of God most mighty saw Abraham returned in safety, with victory, his company all whole, (for he had lost neuer a man) admiring the great prosperous successe, and thinking (as it was true) that by Gods speciall prouidence, and helpe, he had caried himself so prosperously, holding vp his hands to heauen blessed him, and sacrificed a victorius banquet, and richly feasted all his company.* Philo lib. de Abrahamo. Wherby M. Mason may learne, that Melchisedech his banquet prepared for Abraham was not a prophane feast, or a meere ciuill entertainment, but such a religious banquet, as was wont to be made both by Iewes and Gentiles, in such occasions of ioy, and exultation, accompanied with sacrifice to God. And therfore without all shew of reason doth he deny, that Melchisedech offered sacrifice of bread and wine, seeing so many, and so graue fathers do in most expresse words testifie the same, and no one good authour doth deny, or contradict it.

Farther M. Mason dealeth most iniuriously with his authors. For both S. Ambrose and Andradius in the very same places by himselfe cited, do most expressly teach Melchisedech his sacrifice, which M. Mason so peremptorily denieth. Melchisedech (saith S. Ambrose *offered bread and wine*. And commenting vpon the 5. chapter of the epistle to the Hebrewes he saith thus. *Melchisedech was not priest according to the law (of Moyses) but according to the dignity of a singular priesthood, offering to God bread and wine, not the blond* Lib. 4. de Sacram. cap. 3.

of brute beasts, in the order of whose priesthood Christ is made eternall priest.

Andradius disputing with Kemnitius hath a large and learned discourse, wherin he maintaineth against his aduersary, the truth of the vulgar Latine translation: reading the text of Genesis thus: *Melchisedech bringing forth bread and wine, for he was priest of the most high God:* and therby prouiug the Catholique doctrine of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, doth most expressly mention the sacrifice of Melchisedech in bread and wine. Thou maist see him if thou please diligent reader, and detest M. Masons bad dealing with him. But because euery one can neither haue, nor vnderstand the booke being in Latine: I will out of his long discourse set downe here one periode only of his in these words. *As in other things Melchisedeth bare the person of Christ, so did he represent his priesthood, in that he first after the accustomed manner, offered to God as to the author of a most glorious victoire, the bread and wine, which he gaue for the nourishing of Abraham his army.*

In the place cited aboue by M. Maso.

As for Cardinall Caietan, whose singuler interpretation of holy scripture is often worthely reproued, though otherwise a great and learned Doctor I appeale to M. Mason himselfe, whether his authoritie be of such weight as for it alone, any prudent man may follow it in a matter of moment, against the iudgment of all the other Orthodox writters, aswell moderne as auncient. Thaugh he also speaketh rather according to the opinion of Iosephus then his owne as appeareth by his words cited by M. Mason seeing well that in the expositors of this passage, neither old nor new, he can haue any helpe for the ouerthrowing of Melchisedech his sacrifice in bread and wine, he recurreth to the text it self, and to make it seeme to serue his turne somewhat, he boldlie condemneth the auncient vulgar translation of errour, and saith.

Pag 110. 4. *The vulgar translation, which you follow is erroneours: for according to the Hebrew it is not (for he was a priest) but (and he was a priest) as Arias Montanus translateth it, and Ballarmine confesseth. So the clauses are not ioined together with a coniunction causall, but with a copulatiue: therfore your argument drawne from the causall vanisheth away.*

But he himselfe easeth me of the labour in answering this obiectiō: for in the lines immediatlie following, he bringeth diuers examples of the like reading by the copulatiue in the Hebrew, and Greeke, which themselues reade by the causall: as *Esay 64.2.* *Behold thou art angry, and we haue sinned*: which they turne.

Behold

Behold thou art angry, for we haue ſinned. And bleſſed art thou among wome, and the fruite of thy wombe is bleſſed. Which they turne: *becauſe the fruite of thy wombe is bleſſed.* Theſe are M. Maſons examples, wherunto I will adde other two: Geneſis 20. where the Hebrew is: *behold thou ſhalt die becauſe of the woman, which thou haſt taken: and the hath a husband.* they reade with the vulgar tranſlation, *for ſhe hath a husband.* And Geneſis. 24. the Hebrew hath: *And he dwelt in the ſouth.* Which they turne with the vulgar. *For he dwelt in the ſouth.* Seeing therfore M. Maſon and all his reformed brethren confeſſe, that the Hebrew copulatiue is oftē moſt truly turned by the cauſall, and ſeeing it hath euer bene ſo turned in this place (which we now ſpeake of) by the moſt learned and auncient Fathers, as appeareth aſwell by their owne teſtimonies, as by the vulgar Latine tranſlation, which is moſt auncient, and cannot be ſuſpected of partiality, being extant many hundreth yeares before this controuerſie began, is not he more then impudent, that dare condemne the reading of errour? Eſpecially hauing ſeene this ſelf ſame obiection made before by Kemnitius, ſo fully ſatisfied by Andradius, in the place by himſelf alleaged, as he neither can, nor dare ſaie anie thing againſt it, but wittinglie diſſembling the anſwere, wilfully repeateth the obiection, as though it had neuer bene anſwered. Is this ſincere dealing, and worthie a reformer of Gods church? Not hauing much confidence in this ſhift, he thinketh to elude the force of this teſtimonie, another waie and ſaith. *Luke. 1. 42.* *Gen. 20. 3.* *Gen. 24. 62.*

5. *Melchiſedech gaue entertainment to Abraham, moued therunto by conſideration of his owne office, euen becauſe he was not only a profeſſour of the true religion, but alſo a prieſt; For as it becometh all that embrace religion, to loue one another, and reioice at their good; ſo the duty ſpecially belongeth to the prieſt. And your learned Ieſuite Andradius, hance obſerueth the great linke of religion. Therfore is there no neceſsity to ſaie, that he ſacrificed bread and wine: for the text, euen read and pointed as you would haue it, maie in the iudgment of ſome of your learned diuines, admit an excellent ſenſe without any ſacrifice.* *The learned Andradius was no Ieſuit.*

But this is wholly beſides the purpoſe. For firſt Melchiſedech is not ſaid to haue ſacrificed in bread and wine, becauſe there appeareth no other occaſion, why he ſhould bring forth bread and wine to Abrahā, but only to ſacrifice: for none that I know euer dreamed of ſuch a reaſon. But becauſe the ſcripture inter-

preted by the Doctors, and Pastors of Gods church, to whom he hath giuen the keie of knowledge, to interprete his law vnto his people, doth teach, that he did sacrifice in bread and wine, when he mett Abraham. Secondly, the words of the scripture as they haue euer bene read, since they were turned into Latine, cannot haue anie conuenient, or probable sense, without his Sacrifice be vnderstood. For though the Profession of the true religion might be a motiue, why Melchisedech should reioice at Abrahams victorie, and consequently entertaine him with a ciuill, and friendly banquett, yet the holie Ghost giuing for the reason of his bringing out of bread and wine, *that he was the priest of God*, must in anie reasonable mans vnderstanding be thought to expresse something done by Melchisedech, bringing forth bread and wine that was proper only to a priest to do which could be nothing but Sacrifice. For the other frindly entertainment beseemed him rather as a King, agreeing with Abraham in the worship of the true God, then as a priest. And therfore if there had bene no other matter in Melchisedech his bringing forth of bread and wine, then a frindly act of Hospitalitie, the holie Ghost giuing the reasō therof would doubtles haue said. *For he was King of that country*; and not *for he was priest of God most high*. Againe seeing the linke of religiō, as M. Mason saith (after Andradius) might moue Melchisedech to congratulate with Abraham a straunger for his victory, and to entertaine him with a ciuill banquett, rather then to condole with his neighbour Kings for their ouerthrow: the same linke of religion might with greater reason also moue him being a priest, to offer to God Sacrifice of thankesgiuing for his victory, and to receiue him with a religious, and sanctified feast, especially the ancient custome being, that solemne banquets were neuer made, without sacrificing first to God. Neither doth Andradius admitt anie probable sense of those words of Genesis, wherin Sacrifice is not expressed, as M. Mason falsly fathereth vpon him.

6. M. Mason cometh now to cast his short anker, and saith. *Though it be imagined, that Melchisedech offered bread and wine, yet will it be nothing to our purpose. For our Sauiour Christ neuer offered bread and wine in our doctrine, but his body and blood, and therfore from Melchisedech his offering of bread, and wine, can we inferre nothing for the proofe of*

that

that ſacrificing prieſthood, which we pretend to haue bene inſtituted by our Sauiour Chriſt in his laſt ſupper. This is the full ſenſe of that he would ſaie, for his words are too many, and too empty of matter, to make rehearſall therof all at large.

This meane obiect ion which is M. Iewells, or M. Hoopers, S. Cyprian preuented, and anſwered 1300. yeares agoe and more. And therfore my labour in anſwering the ſame, ſhalbe only to relate his words: that if M. Maſon diſdaine to learne his faith, of the preſent Catholique church, yet he maie not refuſe to learne it of the ſame church, teaching the ſame doctrine in S. Cypriansdaies. Thus therfore writeth that ancient prelate, and glorious martyr. *Who is rather the prieſt of the moſt high God, then our lord* Ieſus Chriſt, *who offered ſacrifice to God the Father, and offered the ſame thing that Melchiſedech offered, that is, bread and wine, to wit, his body and bloud?* *Epiſt. ad Cornelianum.*

How can it be, will M. Maſon aske, that our Sauiour Chriſt offered his body and bloud, as S. Cyprian with the Catholique church doth teach, and yet offered the ſame thing which Melchiſedech offered, who offered only bread and wine? This queſtion in M. Maſons beliefe, or rather misbeliefe, is not eaſily anſwered, but in S. Cyprians doctrine, which is that of the Catholique church, it hath ſmall difficulty. For S. Cyprian doth in the ſame place explicate, how both theſe are true, of whom if M. Maſon will learne, he will find this hard queſtion eaſilie, and clearely ſolued. Thus he writeth. *Therfore that the bleſſing of Abraham in Geneſis might be rightly performed by Melchiſedech the prieſt, the image of Chriſts ſacrifice conſtituted in bread and wine went before, which thing our lord perfecting, and fulfilling offered bread and the chalice mixt with wine, and he which is the fulnes (or perfection) did fulfill the truth of the prefigured image.* So that the cleare doctrine of this holy Father is, that our Sauiour Chriſt, who was prefigured by Melchiſedech, offered his bodie and bloud, the truth or thing it ſelfe of that, wherof Melchiſedech offered the figure in bread and wine, and therfore maie truly be ſaid to haue offered the ſame thing, that Melchiſedech did. Which is alſo in another reſpect, to wit, in that the ſacrifice of our Sauiour Chriſt did not differ in externall forme and appearance, from that of Melchiſedech, both of thé being in forme of bread and wine, which is a ſufficient reaſon, why our Sauiour may be ſaid to haue offered in bread and wine,

though

though not in substance of bread and wine. For it is no vnusuall matter in holy scripture, to call things by that name whilk they appeare outwardlie to be, as for example. *Behold two men stood by them in white garments.* And againe. *A man stood before me in white apparell:* and elswhere often.

Acts.1.10.
Acts.10.30.

7. Hauing thus shewed (sufficientlie as I suppose) all M. Masons euasions and shifts, against Melchisedech his offering of bread, and wine, to be of no moment, in comparison of the weightie authoritie brought for it, wherin I haue bene defendant only: he shall now giue me leaue as opponent, to aske him one question, which shalbe this. Wherin he will make the peculier priesthood of Melchisedech to stand? which question is neither impertinent, nor vnprofitable. For seeing it is euident first, that he was a priest. Secondly, that he was priest of an order distinct from that of Aaron, and peculier to himselfe.

Thirdly, that our Sauiour Christ was priest of his order. Fourthly, that it ought chiefly to be honored of all Christians, as appeareth as well by that, that God himselfe would so highly honour it, as to make his owne only sonne priest of that order for our sakes, and therby obliged vs peculiarly, to honour both him and his priesthood, as also by the high, and maiesticall stile, wherwith the holy ghost doth proclaime his order in this manner, *Our lord hath sworne, and it shall not repent him; thou art a priest for euer according to the order of Melchisedech.* All this I saie being euident, it is most necessary for vs to know, wherin this highly honoured priesthood doth consist, which I would learne of M. Mason. But vnles he can shew out of holy scripture some particularitie, proper onlie to this order, (which seeing he reiecteth the Sacrifice of bread and wine, he is no more able to performe, then to pull the sunne out of heauen with his fingers) he can neuer satisfie this demaund. For three things only are mentioned in holy scripture, which Melchisedech did as priest: First that he brought forth bread and wine. Secondly, that he blessed Abraham.

Psal.109.

Genes.14.

Thirdly, that he tooke tithes of him, wherof the two last are common to the priesthood of Aaron, as is manifest by the places cited in the margent, so the first only remaineth as proper to Melchisedech.

Numbers.6.
23.Hebrewes 7.5.

Are

Are not our new maisters more then peruerse, to forsake in a matter of principall moment, the testimony of holy scripture, interpreted by so manie faithfull, and vnpartiall pastors, and to grope after vncertaine fancies, and vaine coniectures of their owne wauering, and wandring braine? But such is the impotent malice of heresie, that it esteemeth not into what euident absurdities it falleth so that the Catholique truth maie be obscured, and drawne into question. When M. Mason shall set downe out of holy scripture, the proper function of Melchisedech his order, that therby we maie come to know the high priesthood of our Sauiour Christ, so extraordinarily established by the immutable oath of his eternall Father, and shall proue it as firmely, as his Sacrificing of bread and wine is proued, he shall saie something to the purpose; till then he must not thinke much, if following his owne singuler fancies, he be esteemed, as all other sectaries are, a seducer of Gods people. Vnles he thinke better, as it is indeede, to turne backe, and follow the trodde path of Gods Catholique church. And that I saie to M. Mason, I vnderstand as said to all those, that deny a Sacrificing priesthood in the church of Christ.

8. He cometh next to declare the eternity, or continuall exercise of our Saniour his priesthood, wherin though he do foolyly erre as he doth in other points, yet because mine intent is not to handle here all matters of controuersie, but onlie such as are necessary for the prooving of a Sacrificing priesthood in the Euangelicall law, which is prooued by the priesthood it selfe of Melchisedech (as we shall see in the end) without disputing this poinct of the eternitie of our Sauiour priesthood, though by this it be also prooued, I will not stand here to refute his errour touching the same. But I will only bring one authority of Theodoretus for this purpose, which I make not choice of amongst many others of the ancient Fathers, because I esteeme it the most formall of all others, but because it is brought by M. Fulke for the contrary end; Yet do I not so much intend hereby to taxe M. Fulke of want of iudgment, in bringing a testimony so cleerely against himselfe, as therby to shew the pouerty of the cause he would maintaine, seeing it is forced to seeke supporte from the, that beare testimony against it, and the force of truth, which he would impugne, which is so euidently strengthened by the

arguments brought for the cõtrary. These are Theodoretus his words vpon the 109. Psalme, as M. Fulke relateth them. *Christ is now a priest, which is sprung of Iuda according to the flesh, not offering any thing himselfe, but is called the head of those that offer, seeing he calleth the church his body, and therfore he exerciseth the priesthood as man, but he receiueth those things that are offered, as God. And the church offereth the tokens of his body and blond, sanctifying all the leauen by the first fruites.* Theodoret saith here three things, out of which is manifestly concluded, the continuall exercise of Christ his priesthood, to consist in the visible Sacrifice of the church, to wit the holy Eucharist. First he saith, that Christ is now a priest. Secondly, that though he offereth nothing himselfe, yet is he the head of those that offer, and consequently doth offer by them. Thirdly that as man he exerciseth euen now his priesthood, to wit concurring as head with those, that offer as his members or ministers. Whereby it is manifest, that in Theodorets doctrine, the cõtinuall exercise of Christ his priesthood consisteth in the visible Sacrifice of the church, Which Sacrifice whether it be the true body and blond of Christ, as the Catholique church teacheth and beleeueth, or no, it pertaineth not to this place to examine, being a distinct questiõ frõ that, which we haue here in hand. Now to returne to the question in hand of Melchisedechs Sacrifice, M. Mason confirmeth his doctrine touching the same in this sort.

Fulke Hebr. 7. sect. 8. ad medium.

9. *The Apostle to the Hebrewes speaking very particularly of the type* (of Melchisedech in respect of Christ) *saith not one word concerning his Sacrifice, but vnfoldeth it in these braunches following. First that he was King of iustice. Secõdly that he was King of peace. Thirdly that he was both King and priest. Fourthly that he blessed Abraham. Fiftly that he receiued tithes of Abraham. Sixtly that he was without Father and mother. Seauenthly, that he had neither beginning of his daies, nor end of his life. Thus the scripture vnfoldeth the type of Melchisedech plentifully and particularly, and yet saith not one word concerning his sacrificing, which is an euident argument, that it is a meere deuise and imagination of mans braine.*

It is true that our Sauiour Christ was prefigured in all these things by Melchisedech: but not only in these for he was also prefigured by him as priest as the holy scripture testifieth psal. 109. And that the Apostle saith nothing of his (Melchisedechs) Sacrifice, it is more thẽ false. For in this 7. chapter to the Hebrewes, doth he insist especially in the inculcating of our Sauiours priesthood,

ſthood, according to the order of Melchiſedech, as is cheefe drift in that chapter (as any man that will reade it ſhall plainlie ſee.) How can therfore any man (that is not blind either with malice, or ignorance) ſaie, that the ſcripture ſpeaketh not one word concerning Melchiſedechs Sacrifice, ſeeing prieſthood, and Sacrifice are no leſſe cõioined togeather, then are fatherhood and generation? Tell me I praie you good Sir, if one ſhould ſaie that M. Maſon is a husband or a Father, according to the ordinarie manner of other husbands and Fathers: ſhould he ſaie nothing concerning thoſe actions, without which all mẽ know you can neither be husband, nor Father? You will not I ſuppoſe denie, but that he ſhould make ſuch mention of them, as that all men might vnderſtand them to be in you.

How therfore can you ſo confidẽtly ſaie, that S. Paul ſaith nothing concerning Melchiſedechs Sacrifice, ſeeing he ſaith ſo much of his prieſthood? vnles peraduenture you can find out ſome prieſthood without Sacrifice, which was yet neuer heard of.

10. *There is not one word* (ſaith M. Maſon) *in the whole Bible to declare, that Melchiſedech was a type of Chriſt in offering ſuch vnbloudy Sacrifice in the formes of bread and wine; And this very ſilence is like the voice of a trumpet proclaiming vnto the world, that popery is the meere inuentiõ of man, and ſhall wither in the roote from whence it ſprung.*

Your threating propheciesSir, are hereticall vanities like thoſe of your Father Luther, who threatned to be the ruine of the Pope; But he is dead and rotten, and the Pope is where he was before he was borne, and ſo ſhall popery (as you ſcornfully tearme the Catholique truth) be, when you and all your fellowes ſhalbe gone, to giue account of your hereſie, and rebelliõ againſt God and his church, with the reſt of all thoſe, that haue impugned the Catholique verity, euer ſince the firſt founding of the ſame. God giue you his holy grace to preuent it by true repentãce; I do not greatly marueile, that you cannot find any word in the whole Bible, declaring Melchiſedechs Sacrifice in bread and wine, in figure of Chriſt vnbloudy Sacrifice. For neuer any heretique could find any word in the Bible (or that which he tooke for the Bible) againſt his hereſie. Arrius could find nothing for the conſubſtantiality of the ſonne with the Father, nor Eunomius

nius or Macedonius, for the diuinity, or godhead of the holie Ghoſt; Neſtorius, Eutiches, Pelagius, and the reſt in like manner, could not find one word in holy ſcripture, for the proofe of the Catholique truth by them impugned. But what then? Shall we therfore ſaie, that the holy Bible contained no one word of all theſe truthes? M. Maſon I am ſure will not ſaie ſo. For though thoſe wretches blinded, with hereticall pride and obſtinacy, could ſee nothing of all this in the holy ſcripture; yet the Catholique Paſtors, who defended againſt them the Catholique truth, did find them all contained therin, as alſo their Catholique ſucceſſours now do this truth, which M. Maſon here impugneth, whoſe iudgments if he will not yeeld vnto, as either ſuſpected of partialitie, and moued with paſſion againſt his errour: or that he eſteemeth his owne iudgment as good as theirs: yet if he haue either but any one ſparke of the light of reaſon, or dramme of modeſtie in him he cannot appeale from the iudgments of thoſe great lights of the world, the Fathers of the primitiue church, againſt whom neither of theſe exceptions can be made, who found in holie ſcripture the Sacrifice of Melchiſedech in bread and wine, in figure of Chriſts vnbloudy Sacrifice, as hath already bene shewed, and M. Maſon himſelfe is at laſt forced to confeſſe in theſe words.

Ibidem. 11. Firſt, *Some of the Fathers ſay not, that Melchiſedech offered bread and wine to God, but to Abraham.* whoe are theſe Fathers? why are they not named? but be it ſo: this doth not for all that exclude the offering therof to God, but rather include it, as is already ſeene. Secondly, (ſaith he) *thoſe which ſay it was offered vnto God as a Sacrifice* (as all do that write either vpon the 14. cap. of Geneſis, or the pſalme 109. or by other occaſion handle this matter) *may meane an Euchariſticall Sacrifice, and not a propitiatory.* So may they meane both, as they doe in deede. *Thirdly if any of the Fathers ſay, that he offered a propitiatory Sacrifice, yet it followeth not, that becauſe they make the oblation of Melchiſedech a type of the Euchariſt, that therfore in the Euchariſt, there is a propitiatory Sacrifice.* And why Sir I praie you doth it not follow? If you conſider that the condition of a type, or figure is alwaies to be leſſe perfect, then the thing it ſelf which is figured by it, you will find it to follow *a fortiori*, or with greater reaſon.

But

But you ſay, that *thoſe which hold ſo* (to wit that Melchiſedech offered a propitiatorie ſacrifice) *muſt make a double oblation of the bread and wine, the firſt to God by way of ſacrifice: the ſecond to Abraham, and the army in the manner of a banquet: the firſt might haue relation to Chriſt vpon the craſſe: the ſecond to the Euchariſt.* There is no doubt, but the fathers vnderſtood this double oblation you ſpeake of, thone to God in ſacrifice, thother to Abraham and his armie for their refreshing but whether the firſt offering in the fathers meaning had relation to Chriſt vpon the croſſe, and not to him as offered vnder the forme of bread and wine in his laſt ſupper, the fathers cleare teſtimonies before alleaged for this purpoſe, yea and M. Caluin, and the Centuriſts ſayings hereafter cited, (whoſe authoritie I hope will ſway ſomething with you) ſhall witnes, you add.

Fourthly, your popiſh maſſing ſacrifice preſuppoſeth tranſubſtantiation, which is contrary to Chriſts inſtitution of the Euchariſt, as in due place ſhalbe declared. Wherfore thoſe fathers, which vnderſtand the Euchariſt according to Chriſts inſtitution, cannot referre the type of Melchiſedech to any tranſubſtantiate ſacrifice.

You flinch M. Maſon, you flinch; what haue you here to do with tranſubſtantiatiō? Our queſtion was whether in the iudgment of the auncient fathers, there be any mention in holy ſcripture of Melchiſedech offering bread and wine, in figure of the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt. Why do you therfore run to the queſtion of tranſubſtantiation? I know the reaſon as well as if I were in your boſome. Your owne eies conuince you of the queſtion in hand, and becauſe your obſtinacie will not permit you to yeeld to the manifeſt truth, you run to that other queſtiō of tranſubſtantiatiō, which cannot orderly be ſpoken of, before thother be decided, as you ſaw your ſelf, when you deferd it to another place.

But to let this paſſe, and to take that only, which victorious truth hath drawne from you, I wil only aske of you, what you thinke of the doctrine of thoſe fathers, who you cōfeſſe to haue taught Melchiſedechs ſacrifice in bread and wine, (be it Euchariſticall or propitiatorie, it ſhall not much import for the preſent) whether it be conformable to ſcripture or no? If you ſay no: you will not be beleeued of any man, that hath but one drā of true iudgment. For who can imagine, that thoſe great lights,

and paſtors of Gods church, whoſe learning, pietie, and other excellent vertues beſeeming the paſtors of Gods church, haue made them venerable to all poſteritie: liuing many hundreth yeares before theſe controuerſies were hatched, and therfore voide of all paſſion and partialitie, were not more like to find out the true ſenſe and meaning of holy ſcripture, and alſo to deliuer it with more ſinceritie, then either you M. Maſon or any of your reformed brethrē, who though you were of equall learning with thoſe auncient fathers (which verie few or none at all will beleeue) and of as great pietie and other vertues as they were (which is euidentlie falſe) yet you being parties in this cauſe, as authors of the controuerſie, your ſinceritie cannot but moſt iuſtlie be ſuſpected, and therfore your iudgment lawfullie excepted againſt as partiall. With no ſhew of reaſon therfore can you ſay, that the auncient fathers doctrine, is not conformable to holie ſcripture in this point. Wherfore if you will ſpeake with anie probabilitie in this matter, you muſt anſwere to the queſtion propoſed affirmatiuelie, and ſay that you thinke the fathers doctrine, teaching the ſacrifice of Melchiſedech in bread and wine, in figure of the holy Euchariſt to be according to holy ſcripture. Wherby you ſhall find, how farr and fowlie you ouerlashed, When you ſaid, *that there is not in the whole bible one word to declare, that Melchiſedech was a type of Chriſt in offering ſuch an vnbloudie ſacrifice in the formes of bread and wine*. And yet farther when you dare to ſay: *VVe denie that Melchiſedech did offer any bread and wine, for a ſacrifice to God*. But I will leaue you to aduiſe with your ſelf (now at your more leaſure) whether theſe propoſitious haue any veritie in them, or no: and will conclude of that which hath hitherto bene ſaid, that (vnles you will deny the euident truth) you muſt neceſſarilie graunt a ſacrificing prieſthood (trulie and properlie, as that was of Melchiſedech) in the law and church of Chriſt, in this diſtinct and briefe manner.

Pag. 215.

Pag. 209.

First we haue out of holie *a* ſcripture Melchiſedechs prieſthood. *b* Secondlie his proper order of prieſthood, diſtinct from that of Aaron. *c* Thirdlie we haue out of ſcripture (interpreted by vncorrupt and vnſuſpected antiquitie) Melchiſedechs ſacrifice in bread and wine, as the proper act of his peculiar prieſthood, and order. *d* Fourthlie we haue out of holy ſcripture, that

a *Geneſis* 14.18.
b *Hebrews* 7.11.12. *&c.*
c *Geneſ.* 14.18.
d *Pſal.* 109. *Hebr. cap.* 7.

that our Sauiour Christ was, and is preist according to the peculier order of Melchisedech: whence followeth, that he sacrificed, according to the rite of Melchisedech in bread and wine. *e* Fiftlie, that he gaue to his Apostles commaundement, and power to do the same thing, which he did, when he offered according to that rite. Sixthlie, that the same power, which he gaue then to his Apostles, remaineth still in his church, and consequentlie, that there is in the church at this day a sacrificing priesthood, no lesse trulie and properlie, then was that of Melchisedech, according to whose order, our Sauiour Christ was ordained preist for euer, by the immutable oath of his eternall father. Such a cleare deduction from holy scripture, interpreted by the ancient church, would I gladlie see in proofe of the Protestats emptie, and naked ministerie, which may the more iustly be exacted of them, because they pretend neither to teach, nor beleeue any thing, but that which may be prooued by holy scripture: but I will now proceede to the second proofe of the Catholique priesthood of holy scriptures.

e Luk. 22. 19

What one of all these six verities can M. Mason vpon any probable ground deny.

The second testimonie of holy scripture, clearlie prooving a sacrificing priesthood in the euāgelicall law, is out of the Prophet Malachie who fortelleth the dignitie of the sacrifice of Gods church, vnder the new testament in this sort. *I haue no will in you saith the Lord of hostes* (speaking to the priests of Aarons order,) *nor offering will I receiue at your hand. For from the rising of the sun to the setting therof, my name is great amongst the Gentiles, and in euery place is there sacrificing, and a cleane oblation is offered to my name.*

Malachie cap 1. 11.

The Protestants do not deny, that this propheſie is fulfilled in the church of Christ: but they deny that this cleane oblation, which the Prophet here speaketh of, is any sensible or proper sacrifice, but a spirituall or inward oblation: vnto which miserable shift they are driuen by force. For if they should grant this cleane oblation here fortold to be a true, proper, and sensible sacrifice, their pretended church should be conuinced to be a Synagogue of Satan, and not the true church of Christ, because it hath no such sacrifice. But if there be any certaine meanes, to find out the true sense and meaning of the holy scripture, either by the sound of the words themselues, or by the circumstance of the place, or the vnderstanding of the auncient church, or agreement

agreement and conformitie, as well with other places of ſcripture, as with naturall reaſon and diſcourſe or by all theſe together, their interpretation of this place is euidentlie falſe, and conſequentlie their reformed church hereticall.

The ſound of the Words. Firſt the words *ſacrificing and cleane oblation* being without any reſtriction drawing them to a ſpirituall ſenſe, are to be vnderſtood in their proper ſignification, and as they ſound, without limitation.

Pag. 220. M. Maſon anſwereth, *that this rule is not generally true. for the Prophet Eſay ſaith. They ſhall bring of their brethren for an offering to the Lord, out of all nations where he vſeth the ſame word that Malachy vſeth, and yet it is not meant that the gentiles ſhould be offered carnally, but ſpiritually.*

Which example maketh clearelie againſt himſelfe: for who ſeeth not that this word (*brethren*) reſtraineth the word (*offering*) to a metaphoricall ſignification. Let him find ſuch a reſtriction in the words of the Prophet Malachie, and then ſhall his example be to ſome purpoſe.

Secondlie the Prophet in the whole chapter ſpeaketh of true, and proper ſacrifices, and maketh a direct and expreſſe antitheſies, or oppoſition betweene this pure ſacrifice, and the ſacrifices of the Iewes, which were proper and ſenſible, and hath not one word of improper, or ſpirituall ſacrifice.

The circumſtance of the place. Thirdlie the properties aſcribed to this ſacrifice, cannot agree with the ſpirituall offerings of praier, praiſe, thankſgiuing and *the like*. For this is ſaid to be one: they are many: this is proper to the church of the gentiles vnder the law of grace: they are common not only with the Iewes vnder the law written: this ſucceedeth the Iewes ſacrifices; they ſucceeded none but are ioined with all ſacrifices of all lawes: this is a cleane ſacrifice, and cannot be polluted by him that offereth it: they (at leaſt in the Proteſtants doctrine) are polluted and as aſtained cloth: by this oblation Gods holy name is ſaid to be greatlie glorified, which is proper to externall and ſenſible ſacrifices: for ſpirituall ſacrifices hauing their being and perfection, from the inward intention, which is hidden from all others, but him alone which offereth them, are not fit to make Gods name magnified by other men, as is euident. Now of the contrarie

Philo. lib. de victimis.

part

part it cãnot be denied, but all thoſe properties do exactlie agree with the ſacrifice, of the bodie and bloud of our Sauiour Chriſt in the holy Euchariſt.

To the firſt of theſe properties M. Maſon ſaith. *That albeit the word vſed by the Prophet be of the ſinguler number, yet by that offering, many offerings may be ſignified, as when it is ſaid ſacrifice and offering thou wouldeſt not haue; where though the word be ſingular yet the ſenſe and meaning is plurall.* *Vbi ſupra.*

But he marketh not, or at leaſt will not marke, that there is as great a difference betweene this ſaying of Malachie: *In euery place a cleane oblation is offered to my name*: and that of the Apoſtle. *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldeſt not haue*; (I meane in reſpect of the number) as there is betweene this ſaying: *the King will receiue no gift or preſent*: and this, *the city will giue to the King a gift or a preſent.* Which firſt ſaying, though it be of the ſinguler number, yet doth it euidentlie import, the refuſall not of any one gift, but of all gifts: wheras the latter ſaying importeth one only ſingle gift or preſent, as euery man may plainlie ſee. *Hebr.* 10.8.

If M. Maſon vnderſtand not the reaſon hereof, and be deſirous to learne it; let him turne backe to his Logique, and ſee the difference betweene the nature of an affirmatiue, and a negatiue propoſition, for here is no place to reade him any longer leſſon of this matter. In the meane while by this example may he ſee, how impertinent his inſtance is for his purpoſe. But his anſwere to the ſecond propertie is not only impertinent, but alſo moſt impious.

13. *They* (the Iewes, ſaith he) *might euerywhere pray and praiſe God aſwell as we, but this was not a diſcharge of their duty, vnles to theſe ſpirituall ſacrifices they annexed carnall: to be offered at the time and place appointed: ſo their ſpirituall ſacrifice were mixed, but ours are meerely ſpirituall, and theſe are proper to the Goſpell.* *Ibidem.*

O traitor of Chriſtianitie: what greater aduantage can a Iew deſire againſt Chriſtian religion, then this confeſſion? to wit that they haue the ſame oblations, and ſacrifices that Chriſtians haue (wherin the profeſſiõ and practiſe of all religion cõſiſteth) and that ouer and aboue, they haue the ſenſible and externall ſacrifice of creatures: wherby they offer vnto God not only their praiers, and praiſes of his name by ſpirituall ſacrifice, but alſo their goods and temporall ſubſtance by externall oblations:

wherin M. Maſon freelie confeſſeth their religion to exceede, and ſurpaſſe ours Such is the obſtinate blindnes of hereſie, that rather then to embrace the Catholique veritie expreſſed in holy ſcripture, and teſtified in all antiquitie, will make the immaculate ſpouſe of Chriſt (*wherof moſt glorious things are ſpoken*) inferiour in religion, and leſſe perfect then the Iewes reprooued Synagogue. And to make vp the meaſure of his malice, againſt Gods church and Chriſtian religiō, he yerrunneth on into more groſſe abſurdities. For to the third propertie of the ſacrifice mentioned by Malachie, which was that it ſucceedeth thoſe of the Iewes, wheras the ſpirituall ſacrifices are ioined with all, and ſucceede none he ſaith.

Pſal. 86. 2.

Ibidem. *Though the ſpirituall ſacrifice of the Iewes and of the Chriſtians were all one in ſubſtance: yet they differed in manner, becauſe as I ſaid theirs were mixtly, ours meerely ſpirituall, and the merely ſucceed the mixed.*

If the ſacrifices of the Iewes were the ſame in ſubſtance with thoſe of the chriſtiās: they ſhould alſo be the ſame in ſubſtance with that of our Saviour Chriſt which notwithſtāding is more then hereticall to affirm.

What other thing is this, then that in ſubſtance the Chriſtian religion and worship of God is the ſame with the Iewes, and differeth from it only in manner; and that in ſuch a manner, as that of the Iewes remaineth the more perfect, ſeeing it containeth the ſame perfection, that the Chriſtian religion doth, and ouer and beſides ſomething more? But M. Maſon thinketh he hath learnedly preuēted this abſurdity in ſaying, *that their ſacrifices were mixedly, and are meerely ſpirituall*, wherby (as I ſuppoſe) he would ſay that ours are better, and more perfect then theirs, which yet is more ſenſeles then the reſt. For I would aske of him, whether by adding the externall, and corporall ſacrifices to the ſpirituall, theſe are made leſſe ſpirituall, and cōſequently leſſe perfect? He cānot ſay yea. For vnles we ſuppoſe, that this additiō ſhould change the nature of the ſpirituall ſacrifice (which M. Maſon will not haue, for he ſaith they are both of one ſubſtāce) it cānot be imagined, how the adding of the corporall, or externall ſacrifice may make the internall leſſe ſpirituall, or leſſe perfect. And he himſelfe will confeſſe the ſame in this example. If one ſhould giue him a purſe with twentie pounds of gold in it, and another ſhould giue him another with as much gold, and beſides with as many peeces of ſiluer more, I thinke not that he wold eſteeme the latter gift of leſſe valew, thē the other for the ſiluer added therunto, but of more worth. So in like manner no man of iudgmēt can eſteeme the ſpirituall ſacrifices of the Iewes,

(which

(which M. Maſon ſaith are the ſame with thoſe of Chriſtiãs) to be either leſſe ſpirituall or leſſe perfect, but rather of more perfection, by reaſon of the corporall ſacrifices adioined therunto. For if it were otherwaies, God hauing cõmaunded thẽ to offer ſuch ſacrifices, ſhould haue commaunded a thing both hurtfull to them, and diſpleaſing to himſelfe (as impayring and diminiſhing the valour, and worth of their ſpirituall ſacrifices) which is verie abſurd to imagine. The Iewes therfore haueing the ſame ſpirituall offerings that Chriſtians haue, as M. Maſon confeſſeth, and ouer and aboue other corporall ſacrifices commaũded, and ordained by God himſelfe, (and therfore cannot be hurtfull to thother being good in themſelues) it muſt neceſſarilie follow, that in M. Masõs doctrine, the Iewes offerings and ſacrifices are more perfect, then thoſe of the Chriſtians, and conſequentlie their religion alſo and manner of Gods worshipe more perfect. So that M. Maſon, whilſt he wil be a Proteſtãt in this point, doth prooue himſelf more a Iew then a Chriſtian, and yet he goeth forward in moſt palpable abſurdities. For anſwering to the fourth propertie, which was that this ſacrifice ſpoken of by Malachie, is ſo cleane of it ſelfe, that it cannot be polluted by the prieſt that offereth it, be he neuer ſo wicked; wheras the ſpirituall ſacrifices, being our workes are ſtained, and vncleane in the Proteſtants iudgment: anſwering I ſay herunto, he verie wittilie as he thinketh, retorteth the argument in this ſort.

14. *Are all our ſpirituall offerings vncleane? then all our good workes are vnperfect, and if they be vnperfect, they cannot iuſtifie, they are not meritorious, nor ſatisfactory.* *Ibidem.*

But moſt ignorantlie (by his good leaue be it ſpoken) doth he inferre theſe conſequences againſt the Catholiques, vpon an antecedent which is his owne only and none of theirs. For this antecedent *all our good workes are ſtained, vncleane, and vnperfect*, is the doctrine of Proteſtants, and not of the Catholiques, therfore though the Catholiques do inuinciblie inferre therupon againſt them, that our workes cannot in their doctrine be that cleane oblation ſpoken of by Malachie, becauſe one of thoſe propoſitions both euidentlie deſtroie, and contradict thother: yet cãnot they vpon the ſame antecedẽt (which as I ſaid is none of ours) inferre againſt vs, that our workes are not meritorious or ſatisfactorie. Mary whether vpon the contrarie propoſition, to wit

(the good workes of men proceeding from Gods grace are cleane, meritorious, and satisfactorie) which we acknowledge to be our doctrine, may be inferred, that they are that cleane oblation mentioned by Malachie, is another question, which shall by and by de touched. But we will first see, how M. Mason accordeth these two things together, that our workes are vncleane, and yet are the cleane oblation here spoken of: which two ends if he can well bring together, he shalbe a Maister Mason indeed; thus he discourseth.

They (that is our good workes) *are cleane but vnperfectlie*: that is in plaine English they are cleane, but they are not cleane, which is a plaine contradiction: for that which is vnperfectlie cleane, is not cleane, as all men know I thinke. Well let him goe for ward, perhaps he will make something of this matter at least.

They are cleane (saith he) *because they proceede from the christaline fountaine of the spirit of grace: they are vnperfect*) he should haue said vnperfectlie cleane, if he had minded what he went about, but pardon him for he is in a maze) *because they are wrought by the will of man, which is regenerate only in part, and so the pure water gathereth mudd, because it runneth thorough a muddy channell.*

O more then muddie braine. Marke I pray thee, iudicious reader, how grosslie he buildeth one absurd errour vpon another. To prooue that mans workes, euen such *as proceed from the christaline fountaine of the spirit of grace*, are vnpure, or vnperfectlie cleane, he saish that they are wrought *by the will of man, which is regenerate only in part*. An euident falsitie, directlie against many cleare testimonies of holy scripture, wherof I will brieflie point at two or three. a *The workes of God are perfect*. b *Be baptised and wash away thy sins*. c *He hath saued vs by the lauer of regeneration, and renouation of spirit*. d *I will power vpon you cleane water, and you shalbe cleansed from all your contaminations*. e *Thou shalt wash me, and I shalbe whiter then snow*; with many others to the same effect, not necessarie here to be specified.

a *Deuteron.* 32. 4.
b *Act.* 22. 17
c *Tit.* 3. 5.
d *Ezech.* 36. 25.
e *Psal* 50.

By all which it is euident, that Gods grace being in the soule of man doth purifie and cleanse it in such manner, that it is made whiter then snow or wooll: how then can any man imagine, that

that it should leaue the soule so impure, or to vse M. Masons metaphore so muddie, that it maie infect and defile those workes, which proceed from the same cleare fountaine of grace? False therfore is the ground, wherupon M. Mason would infer the impurity, or vnperfect cleannes of our workes proceeding from the Spirit of Gods grace.

Well then (maie M. Mason saie) if they be cleane, they maie the rather be that cleane oblation mentioned by Malachie, and so haue I made a good argument for him, and against my selfe: I haue argued for the manifest truth, and neither for him, nor against my selfe, as we shall see by and by, after I haue discouered one point more of M. Masons absurd doctrine. Vpon his last words he maketh vnto himself this obiection.

15. *If they be muddy, how can they be called the pure offering in Malachy?* Wherunto he answereth in these words.

Because (saith he) *the denomination is of the worthier part, and the graces of God in his children are in like vnto the light, which shineth more and more vnto the perfect daie: and though the flesh rebelleth against the Spirit yet at lenght the Spirit shall haue the victory, and the flesh shalbe abolished. In meane time though our good woorkes be stained with the fleh, yet God looketh not vpon them as an angry iudge, but as a louing Father crowning his owne graces in vs, and pardoning our offences. Now because they are imperfect, they cannot iustify, merite nor satisfy, yet because they are Gods graces, they are the pure offering.* Prouerb. 4. 18.

Here are scarse so manie words in this answere, as three are absurdities and impertinencies, and in summe nothing prooued either by reason or authority, but barelie affirmed, and therfore might with good reason, without anie Farther refutation as easilie be denied: but I will deale more courteouslie with him, and take some paines to refutt his paradoxes.

Our good workes (saith he) *though muddy maie be called the pure offering in Malachy, because the denomination is of the worthier part: to wit of that, which proceedeth from the Spirit of Gods grace.* Here are two grosse absurdities. The one in supposing that our good workes haue two parts, thone cleane as proceeding from Gods grace, thother vncleane as proceeding from the will of man regenerate in part. According to which doctrine not only our good workes, but our greatest abominations may be called the cleane offering in Malachie: becaus all our workes, be they neuer so bad, proceed

Esaie.26 12. Iob.15.5. ceed from God according to some part (as M. Mason speaketh) *For he worketh in vs all our workes* (saith the Prophet) And our Sauiour himselfe: *Without me you can do nothing*: in respect of which part they maie be said to be cleane, as prooceeding from God: and becausse the denomination is taken (as he saith) of the worthier part, those very wicked workes maie be said to be a cleane offering. This I suppose M. Mason will not deny to be most wicked doctrine, and yet how he will auoide it according to his grounds I see not.

Taugh all our workes proceed frō God, and necessarily dependof him, yet is he not the cause or author of our badd workes. For those he only permitteth: giueing vs strengh to work, and leaueing vs in our liberty to vse it as we will.

If he aske me how this inconuenience may be auoided in the Catholique opinion, which teacheth that all our workes proceede frō God; or depend of him I answere that it is easily auoided in true diuinitie, and Philosophie, according to which our whole actions do proceed from God, or depend of him and neuertheles the same whole actions proceed also from vs, but after a diuers sort and order. For from God they proceede as frō the first, vniuersall, indeterminate, and independent source, or agent: from vs as from a secondarie, dependent, and limited, or determinate cause, from whence they take their nature, qualitie, valour and denomination: so that they are wholly good, or whollie bad, and not partie coloured, as M. Mason would haue them. Which point becausse it is somewhat nice, and subtill, and not easie to be vnderstood of euerie one, I will make more plaine by this example. The actions or operations, wherby the fire bringeth forth heate or fire, an appletree bringeth forth an apple, a horse begetteth a horse, or a man a man, and the actions of all other creatures whatsoeuer, do proceede frō God as from the first and supreame cause, from the heauens or the sun, as from an inferiour, or secondarie cause or argent (for without the cooperation of these causes, the inferiour agents can do nothing) and also from the fire, tree, horse, man, or other creature, as from the lowest, neerest, and most immediate cause. And no action, or operation of these inferiour creatures is produced, but by the concurse, and cooperation of all these agents not in part, as if one part were produced by God, another by the sun, and a third by the fire, or other creature, but euery one of these agents cōcurre to the producing of the whole action, but in his order and degree, and though all these causes do concurre to euerie one of these actions, yet is it not meanie actions

nie actions of diuers natures, but one only action and of one nature or qualitie, and therfore that, which is brought forth by it is one onlie thing, for example heate, fire, apple, horſe, man or the like, and not partlie fire or apple, and partlie another thing. Farther that, which is brought forth by anie one of theſe actions, proceeding (as is alreadie noted) from all theſe ſubordinate cauſes, taketh it whole nature and qualitie from the immediate, and neareſt cauſe, for example that which is brought forth by the actiō of the fire together with the other ſuperiour cauſes, is fire, and not party fire, and partlie anie other ſubſtanco, and ſo in the reſt.

Our good workes thaugh only morall, do otherwaies proceed from God, thē doe our badd For our good workes God counſelleth, and oftētimes maundeth, and therfore by his inſpirations moueth as vnto thē but our badd workes he forbideth and by threats of punishment withdraweth vs from thē, and haueing giuen vs ſtrengh to worke, only permitteth vs to worke ill. Al. this tendeth only to ſhew how our actions are either wholy good, or wholy badd, and not to ſhewe that our good actions do not chiefly proceed frō God.

And the reaſon hereof is, becauſe the cooperation of the fire being determined to one effect, doth determine the concurrence, and cooperation of the ſuperiour agents, (which of themſelues are indifferent, and as fitt to bring forth any other thing as fire) to this determinate effect. The fire therfore or apple haue not the being, eſſence, or nature of fire or apple rather then anie other, frō the cooperation or concurrence of God, or the ſun, but from the fire or the tree, from whence they proceede immediatly, though they do as truly proceed from the ſun and from God, as they do from the fire and from the tree. So in like manner our morall actions do take their whole nature, qualitie, and morall valour good or bad from vs, from whom they immediatlie proceede, and not from God: though they as truly proceede from him (foraſmuch as pertaineth to the ſubſtance of the action) as from vs. Therfore if they be according to the rule or preſcript of right reaſon (which is the meaſure of all humane actions) they are good, honeſt, and laudable, not in part but in whole, though they proceede from man as well as from God, as an apple is an apple not in part but in whole, though it proceede as well from the ſun and from God, as from the tree. If they be not according to the preſcript of right reaſon, they are vitious, inhoneſt, and blameworthie, not in part but in the whole, though the whole ſubſtance of the action proceede from God as well as from man, becauſe the nature, and qualitie of the action is taken from the immediate agent, as is noted before. And Farther if they proceede not onlie from our free will guided by the light of nature, but alſo from the pure fountaine of heauenlie grace, they are not only morallie good

and

and honeſt, but meritorious before God of the increaſe of grace and glorie, not in part, but in whole. Falſe therfore and friuolous is M. Maſons imaginarie mixture of our workes, according to diuers parts, wherof one should be good and another bad, one cleane and another vncleane.

Thother abſurditie contained in M. Maſons former word is *that our workes are denominated of the worthier part.* For though it were true, as it is alreadie prooued to be moſt falſe, that our workes had two parts, thone cleane, thother vncleane (as M. Maſon neceſſarilie ſuppoſeth when he ſaith, that they are nominated of the worthier part) yet would it be falſe, and abſurd to ſay, that they take their nomination of the worthier part. For the contrary is moſt true, as appeareth by that euident rule of nature noted firſt by S. Dennis, and ſince receiued of all as well Philoſophers, as diuines, that *that which is good is of a perfect cauſe, but euill is of euery particuler defect.* So that, that worke, or action, which hath in it anie defect, is truly ſaid to be euill, and conſequentlie all our workes being in part vncleane, (according to M. Maſons doctrine) muſt needs be naught, and therfore cannot be that pure offering foretold by Malachie. And this is euident by the common iudgment of all men, who eſteeme a man or woman bad, though they haue but one bad qualitie or condition, ſo wee ſaie a rotten apple or crackt veſſell, though the greater part therof be good and ſound: and we ſaie likewiſe a lame man and a tearne coate, though he want the vſe but of one hand or foote, or there be but one hole in the coate: By all which exiples and a thouſand more it is euident, that M. Maſons propoſition is moſt falſe, whoſe errour in this particuler proceedeth of ignorance in naturall Philoſophie, which teacheth him to diſtinguish betwixt thoſe things, that ſo conſiſt of two poſitiue parts, that thone is the forme in reſpect of the other, in which his propoſition of taking denomination from the worthier part is true. And therfore a man is ſaid to be a reaſonable creature in reſpect of his ſoule, which is the worthier part, and a horſe is ſaid to be a liuing, mooving, and ſenſible thing, for the like reaſon. And betwixt thoſe things that are compoſed, or conſiſt (to ſpeake as the vulgar ſort conceiueth) of one poſitiue, and another negatiue or priuatiue part, as a man may be ſaid to conſiſt of a whole, and a lame legg, an apple of a ſound and rotten ſide,

De diuini nominibus. Bonum ex integra cauſa, malum ex quocumque defectu. Dion.

and

and the like. In all which the denomination alwaies followeth the defectiue part, for the reason giuen before out of S. Dennis: and of this latter kind are our workes and actions, which when they want anie circumstance, or perfection which is due vnto them, and which they ought to haue (as all our actions do in M. Masons doctrine) are alwaies said to be euill and naught; and therfore can in no sort be said to be that pure offering mentioned by the Prophet Malachie.

Hauing thus refuted M. Masons shifts, concerning the pure offering so often mentioned, I will now satisfie the obiection before insinuated, which maie be framed out of the Catholique doctrine in fauor of M. Mason in this sort.

16. The good workes of a iust man proceeding from Gods grace are meritorious, satisfactorie, and iustificatiue, and consequentlie are pure and cleane. Why therfore maie they not be that pure offering mentioned in the Prophet Malachie?

The answere is easie. For though a iust mans workes, which proceede from Gods grace, be pure and cleane, yet can they not be that pure offering, wherof the Prophet Malachie speaketh, for diuers reasons, wherof some part are alreadie touched. Namelie for that the Sacrifice fortold by Malachie is a true and proper Sacrifice, wheras our good workes are but metaphoricallie, and vnproperly called a Sacrifice: that is but one; these are manie; that is proper to the church of the gentiles: these are common to the Iewes and gentiles. That succeedeth the Sacrifices of the Iewes: these are ioined with all Sacrifices, and succeede none. Therfore the holy ghost reprooving the priesthood and Sacrifice of the Iewes in respect of that of the gentiles, it must needs be, that he ment some other Sacrifice, then all that which the Iewes offered: who notwithstanding offered the same Spirituall Sacrifice of prayer, praise, and thanks giueing, that the Christian gentiles doe. For otherwais the Sacrifice of the gentiles, if it were no other then of Prayer, and praise, could not be so preferred before that of the Iewes as that it should be approoued by God, and thother. All these reasons are alreadie touched, and shew manifestly, that our good workes although neuer so cleane, and pure, cannot

be that pure offering mentioned by the Prophet; which will also more euidently appeare by that, which shall now be said to prooue, that the testimony of Malachy is necessarilie to be vnderstood of a proper, sensible, and externall Sacrifice. From prosecuting of which point I haue bene thus farr deturned, by occasion of M. Masons odd shifts thrust in to thwart my purpose. To returne therfore thither where I lefte before, I saie.

Conferēce of places.

27 Fourthly that the pure oblation spoken of by the Prophet Malachie being vnderstood of a true and proper Sacrifice, agreeth rightly with other places of holie scripture; and namely with that of Genesis. *But Melchisedech brought forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of God most high.* And that of S. *Luke*. *This is my bodie which is giuen for you, do this for a commemoration of me.* And of the Psalme. *Thou art a priest for euer according to the order of Melchisedech*. And of S. Paul. *VVe haue an altar, wherof they haue not power to eate that serue the tabernacle*. And of Daniell. *They shall take away the dailie Sacrifice*. Which places cannot literallie be vnderstood without a proper and sensible Sacrifice in the new lawe. Againe the propheſie of Malachie being vnderstood, is not repugnant to anie other testimonie of holie scripture, as shall clearely appeare hereafter.

Gen. 14.
Luke 22. 19.
Psal. 109.
Hebr. 12. 10.
Dan. 11. 31. & 12. 11.

Fiftly, the testimonie of Malachie being vnderstood in the foresaid sense is no lesse consonant with naturall reason, then conformitie with true reason are the Sacrifices of the law of nature, and of Moises, yea by so much more conformable to naturall reason it is, that we should haue a true and proper priesthood, and Sacrifice in the law of grace, then in that either of Moises or of nature, by how much greater the of gratitude, and thankfulnes we haue to God our soueraigne Lord for greater blessings and benefits receiued, then they had that liued vnder the former lawes. marke the testimonie of S. Ireneus following.

Interpretatiō of the auncient church.

Sixtlie the auncient church of the first two, three, foure, and fiue hundreth yeares after Christ, the iudgment whereof our aduersaries dare not refuse, vnderstandeth this oblation to be a true, and proper Sacrifice, and that verie same which our Sauiour Christ offered in his last supper. Which onlie reason is more then sufficient to perswade

any

any one (well affected either to his owne ſaluation, or to the knowledge of the truth it ſelfe) of the true ſenſe and meaning of theſe words.

And to begin with moſt auncient Irenæus, who liued within the ſecond hundreth yeare after Chriſt: that is more then 1400. yeares agoe. thus he writeth.

Sed & Apoſtolis ſuis dans conſilium, primitias Deo offerre ex ſuis creaturis, non quaſi indigenti, ſed vt ipſi nec infructuoſi nec ingrati ſint, cum qui ex creatura Panis eſt, accepit & gratias egit dicens: Hoc eſt corpus meum. *Et Calicem ſimiliter, qui eſt ex creatura quæ eſt ſecundum nos, ſuum ſanguinem confeſſus eſt, & noui teſtamenti nouam docuit oblationem, quam eccleſia ab Apoſtolis accipiens, in vniuerſo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præſtat, primitias ſuorum munerum in nouo teſtamento, de quo in duodecim prophetis Malachias ſic præſignificauit: non eſt mihi voluntas in vobis, dicit Dominus exercituum, & ſacrificium non ſuſcipiam de manu veſtra, ab ortu enim ſolis, vſque ad occaſum magnum eſt nomen meum in gentibus, & in omni loco incenſum offertur nomini meo & ſacrificium purum, ma-*

But giuing councell to his Apoſtles, to offer to God the firſt fruites of his creatures, not as if he ſtood in need, but that they ſhould neither be vnfruitfull nor vngratefull, he tooke bread and gaue thãkes ſaying. This is my body: *and in like mãner the chalice he confeſſed to be his bloud, and taught a new offering of the new teſtament which the church receiuing frõ the Apoſtles, offereth through the whole world to God, who giueth vs food, the chiefe of his gifts in the new teſtamẽt, wherof Malachy one of the twelue prophets foretelleth in this mãner. I haue no will in you ſaith our lord of hoſtes, nor offering will receiue at your hand: for frõ the riſing of the ſunn to the going downe therof, my name is great amõgſt the gẽtils, and in euery place incenſe and a pure ſacrifice is offered to my name, moſt manifeſtly ſignifying by theſe words, that the former people*

nifestissimè significans per hac, quoniam prior quidem populus cessauit offerre Deo; omni autẽ loco sacrificium offertur Deo & hoc purum.

(the Iewes) haue ceased to offer to God, and that in all places is offered to God a sacrifice, and that pure.

Which words iudicious reader if thou diligently marke, thou wilt find that if this holy Father had liued in our daies, he could not almost haue spoken more directlie against the Protestants heresie, in this point. First he giueth the reason, why our Sauiour taught his Apostles to offer Sacrifice to God, that they should neither be without the Spirituall fruite of Gods grace, nor vngratefull to him for his benefits receiued; as if without Sacrifice they should be both. Secondlie he teacheth what this Sacrifice is: to wit the bodie and bloud of our Sauiour Christ, and how it is offered, in these words: *this is my bodie: this is my bloud:* Thirdlie he saith that Christ in this action taught a new Sacrifice of the new testament, and therfore such an one as had not bene before, as the Spirituall Sacrifices of our workes are. Fourthlie that this Sacrifice being deliuered by the Apostles to the church, is offered to God through the whole world, and therfore cannot be the Sacrifice of our Sauiour Christ, as he was offered vpon the crosse. Fiftly he saith that the prophet Malachie foretold the same in the words related out of him. All which things well weighed, I do not see what could be said more direct for the proofe either of the churches Sacrifice, or that it was foretold by Malachie the Prophet.

Aug. de ciuit. lib. 18. cap. 35.

S. Augustin teacheth the same veritie in as plaine tearmes saying:

Malachias Prophetans ecclesiam, quam per Christum iam cernimus propagatam Iudæis apertissimè dixit ex persona Dei: non est mihi voluntas in vobis: & munus non suscipiam de manu vestra; Ab ortu enim solis vsque ad occasum

Malachias fortelling the church which we see propagated by Christ doth in the person of God most plainlie saie vnto the Iewes. I haue no will in you, nor offering will I receiue at your hand. For from the rising of the sun

occasum, magnum est nomen meum in gentibus, & in omni loco sacrificabitur, & offeretur nomini meo oblatio munda: quia magnum est nomen meum in gentibus, dicit Dominus. Hoc sacrificium per sacerdotium Christi secundum ordinẽ Melchisedech, cum in omni loco à solis ortu vsq; ad occasum Deo iam viaeamus offerri, sacrificium autem Iudæorum, quibus dictum est: non est mihi voluntas in vobis, cessasse negare non possunt: quid adhuc alium Christum, quum hoc quod Prophetatum legunt, & impletum vident impleri non potuerit nisi per ipsum?

to the going downe therof my name is great amongst the Gentiles, and in euerie place is there sacrificing, and a pure oblation is offered to my name. This sacrifice of the priesthood of Christ according to the order of Melchisedech, seeing we see offered in all places from the sun rising to the setting therof: And they cannot deny the sacrifice of the Iewes (to whom it was said I haue no will in you) to be ceased: why do they yet expect another Christ, that being fulfilled, which they reade to haue bene foretold, and could be fulfilled by none but him?

And vvhat S. Augustin meaneth by the sacrifice of Christs priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech, thou shalt heare (good reader) of himselfe, vvho in another place vvritteth thus.

Hæc quippe ecclesia, est Israël secundum spiritum, à quo distinguitur ille Israël secundum carnem, qui seruiebat in vmbris sacrificiorum, quibus significabatur singulare sacrificium, quod nunc offert Israël secundum spiritum; cui dictum atque prædictum est: Audi populus

For this church is Israël according to the spirit, frõ which is distinguished that according to the flesh, which serued in the shadowes of sacrifices, whereby was signified one singuler sacrifice, which the spirituall Israël now offereth; to which it was told and foretold: Heare

Lib. 1. cont. aduers. legis & Prophet. c. 20.

pulus meus & loquar tibi, Israël & testificabor tibi &c. De huius enim domo non accepit vitulos, neque de gregibus eius hircos. Iste immolat Deo sacrificium laudis, non secundum ordinem Aaron, sed secundum ordinem Melchisedech. Nouerunt qui legunt quid protulerit Melchisedech quando benedixit Abraham. Et iam participes eius, vident tale sacrificium nunc offerri Deo toto orbe terrarum.

my people and I will tell thee, Israël and I will testify vnto thee I God am thy God, I will not receiue calues of thy house, nor goates of thy heards. For from the house of this spirituall Israël he receiueth not calues, nor goates frō her heards. This Israël offereth to God a sacrifice of praise, not according to the order of Aaron: but according to the order of Melchisedech. They know that reade it, what Melchisedech brought forth when he blessed Abrahā, and now they are partakers therof: and see such a sacrifice offered to God throught the whole world.

Now do I appeale to thy iudgment, indifferent reader, whether M. Mason (affirming this testimonie of the Prophet Malachie to be vnderstood of spirituall offerings, by the iudgment of the fathers, and namelie of these two) doth not say either he careth not, or knoweth not what? But let vs see, vpon what ground he affirmeth a thing so farre from all appearance of truth. Marie because these fathers with S. Hierome, and Eusebius say, that by *incense* (which according to some readings the Prophet here mentioneth) are vnderstood the praiers of saints, which are spirituall offerings: This is true indeede: but nothing to the purpose. For both the Prophet Malachie, and all these fathers speake expreslie of a cleane offering, ouer and aboue the incense: the text it selfe as M. Mason turneth it being this: *In euerie place incense shalbe offered vp to my name, and a pure offering.* Be it therfore that these fathers vnderstand by incense the praiers of saints, yet by the pure offering expressed by the Prophet, they with all the rest that handle this matter, do vnderstand the sacrifice

Pag. 219.

crifice of the holy Euchariſt, euen by M. Caluins owne confeſſion as we ſhall ſee by and by.

Againe though by incenſe the fathers vnderſtand the praiers of ſaints, yet is there no reaſon to thinke, that they ſhould therby exclude a true, and proper externall oblation, and ſacrifice, more then the ſweet odor, which God ſmelled from the ſacrifice of Noe, did exclude, or take away the true externall oblation of beaſts and foules, which he made to God at his iſſue out of the Arke. So that M. Maſon without the leaſt ſhew of reaſon, affirmeth the aforementioned fathers to vnderſtand this teſtimonie of Malachie onlie of ſpirituall offerings: which is yet farther, moſt euidentlie conuinced out of S. Auguſtin, and S. Chriſoſtome, who vſe this teſtimonie of the Prophet Malachie againſt the Iewes, to prooue that the Meſſias is alreadie come, by the change of the Leuiticall ſacrifice into that, which is foretold by the Prophet. Which argument (the Prophet being vnderſtood of ſpirituall ſacrifices) could be of no force at all. For beſides that theſe ſpirituall ſacrifices being principally internall, cannot be vnto men, who ſee not that which is in the hart, any euident ſigne of another thing wherof they ſtand in doubt, as the Iewes do of that point, that the Meſſias is alreadie come, and therfore ſhould verie impertinentlie be brought to prooue it. Beſides this I ſay, theſe fathers who vſe this teſtimonie, if they ſhould vnderſtand it only of ſpirituall offerings, as M. Maſō would haue them, could not inferre therupon any change of the Iewes ſacrifices into ſome better, which the Prophet plainlie fortelleth, ſaying in the perſon of God. *I will take no offering at your hands, for in all places is offered to my name a pure offering*: but a bare ceſſation of the Iewes externall ſacrifices, without ſubſtituting any other in their place, and continuation of the internall, which they wanted not? And conſequentlie the Iewes ſhould hereby rather be confirmed in their errour, then drawne from it, ſeeing by this argument their religioni prooued to be more perfect, then that of the Chriſtians, as is before clearelie deduced.

Gen. 8. 21.

Auguſt lib. 18. de ciuitat. cap. 25. Chriſoſtom. orat. 3. cont. Iudaos ante finem.

And I appeale to M. Maſons owne iudgment, whether if he where at this daie to prooue vnto a Iew, that the Meſſias whom he expecteth, is alreadie come, he would thinke this teſtimonie of the Prophet Malachie, vnderſtood only of

Spirituall

Spirituall Sacrifices, would be a God *medium* for his purpose? I haue not so bad an opinion of his iudgment to thinke, that he would verelie take it so to be: for it is euident, that this place so vnderstood could haue no shew of proofe at all against the Iewe: which seeing it is so, how can he thinke that S. Augustin, and S. Chrisostome, the latter especiallie disputing expreslie against the Iewes, should vse so impertinent an argument? can he thinke that they were lesse iudicious, in choosing their testimonies against their aduersaries, then he would be? And I would haue him obserue, that S. Chrisostome doth not only vrge the latitude of the place, where the sacrifice of the new law is to be offered, which the Prophet expresseth in these words, *from the rising of the sun to the going downe therof*, and *in euerie place*, but also much insisteth vpon the sanctitie of this sacrifice aboue that of the Iewes, declared by the Prophet in these words *a pure offering*, and that not only in respect of the imperfectiō which the Iewes sacrifice might haue, from the offerers, but in respect of the verie offering it selfe, wherof he saith thus.

Si quis ipsum hoc sacrificium conferat cum alio, ingēs, immensumq; discrimen inueniet, vt iuxta comparationis rationem solum hoc purum dici possit.

If this sacrifice (foretold by Malachie) *be compared with that* (of Moyses lavv) *so huge and incomparable difference will appeare betwixt, thē, that in comparison this mentioned by Malachie may only be called pure.*

Whereby it euidentlie appeareth that S. Chrisostome speaketh of some other sacrifice, then of the spirituall sacrifices of our good workes, which cannot so farre exceed the sacrifices of the Iewes, whose spirituall sacrifices were the same with ours, as M. Mason expreslie confesseth.

18. But if all these reasons will not perswade M. Mason to thinke, that the fathers vnderstood by the pure offering, mentioned by the Prophet Malachie, an externall, sensible, and proper sacrifice, and that they taught such a sacrifice to remaine in Christs church, he will (I doubt not) do that honour to his great Maister. M. Caluin, as to credit his iudgment herein:

as if he will decline and disclaime from him, as being the father of the puritane faction, yet in no reason can he refuse the sentence, of those great lights of the Protestant church the Centurists, who will tell him the same; but let vs heare the words as well of one as thother.

M. Caluin vvriteth thus.

Cum obijciunt locum Malachiæ sic ab Irenæo exponi (de Sacrificio missæ) oblationem Melchisedech sic tractari ab Athanasio, Ambrosio, Augustino, & Arnobio: breuiter responsum sit eosdem illos scriptores alibi quoque panẽ interpretari Christi Corpus: sed ita ridiculè, vt dissentire nos cogat ratio & veritas.

When they obiect the place of Malachie to be vnderstood so (of the Sacrifice of the masse) by Ireneus: and the offering of Melchisedech, to be handled in like manner by Athanasius, Ambrosius, Augustin, and Arnobius, it is briefly answered, that these same writers do in other places, also interprete bread the bodie of Christ: but so ridiculously, that reason and truth constraineth vs to dissent from them. Cal. lib. de vera eccl. reform.

Here vve see the Sacrifice of the Masse, and reall presence of Christ in the blessed Sacrament, to haue bene beleeued and taught by the Fathers, both of the east and vvest church, aboue twelue, and thirteen hundreth yeares agoe euen by Caluins ovvne confession. The Centurists saie also of S. Irenæus.

De oblatione porrò Irenæus lib. 4. cap. 32. satis videtur loqui incommodè, cum ait novi testamenti nouam docuit (Christus) oblationem, quam ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in vniuerso mundo offert Deo.

That he speaketh not well of the oblatiõ, whẽ he saith that Christ taugh a new offering of the new testament, which the church receiuing from the Apostles doth offer to God through the whole world. Cent. 2. col. 63.

And of S. Cyprian, vvho liued vvithin the third hundreth yeare of Christ, the same authors testifie that he saith.

Cent. 3. col. 83. *Sacerdotem inquit (Cyprianus) vice Christi fungi, & Deo patri Sacrificium offerre.* — *That the priest performeth the office of Christ, and offereth sacrifice to God the Father.*

For vvhich speech they reprooue him of superstitiõ, in their alphabeticall table of that century vnder the letter 5.9.

Now though I might iustly suppose these most pregnant testimonies of corrupted antiquitie, grounded vpon the expresse words of holie scripture, abundantly sufficient to prooue the truth of the Catholique faith in this point of a sacrificing priesthood in the law of Christ: yet because this veritie doth not only serue to conuince the protestants of want of true Bishops and pastors (for which purpose it is here disputed) and consequently of the like want of a true church, but also is a point principallie impugned and controuersed, by them, I will for the more abundant and euident cleering therof here adde the testimonies of the auncient pastors, and Doctors of Gods church, of the first 500. yeares after Christ, not of anie one countrie or nation, but of all the three parts of the Christian world, Asia, Africke, and Europe, that therby the partialest reader maie see, this doctrine to haue had no other authors or beginners then them, of whom the holy ghost saith. Psal. 15. 5. *Their sound hath gone forth thorough all the earth, and their words haue raught to the ends of the round world.*

Theodoret. Dialogi. 1. To begin therfore vvith S. Ignatius that most glorious martir, made Bishop of Antioch in Syria by S. Peter himselfe, and is cited by Theodoret Bishop of Cyre 1100. yeares agone. This great personage speaking of certaine heretiques saith.

Theodoret. Dialogo. 3. *Eucharistias & oblationes non admittunt, quod non confiteantur Eucharistiam esse* — *They receiue not the oblations and Eucharists, because they beleeue not that*

carnem sexnatoris nostri IESV CHRISTI *quæ pro peccatis nostris passa est.*

the Eucharyst is the flesh of our Sauiour IESVS Christ, *which flesh suffered for our sins.*

S. Iustinus a Ievveborne in Palestina, vvho suffered martirdome 1400. and 50. yeares agoe saith. *Dial cũ Tripho. printed at Basill.*

De Sacrificio quod offertur à nobis gentibus in omni loco, id est Eucharistiæ tum pane, tum poculo, prædicit (Malachias) *dicens nos clarificare nomen eius.*

Of the Sacrifice which is offered by vs in euery place, to wit of bread and wine of the Eucharist, Malachie foretold saying, that therby we glorify his name.

Of S. Irenæus Archbishop of Lions in France and martir, who liued more then 1400. and 40. yeres agoe see a most pregnant testimony before in this same chapter.

Tertulliã borne and brought vp in Africke in his booke of prayer vvritten, vvhilest he vvas yet Catholique, aboue 1400. yeares agoe. *De orationc cap. 14.*

Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si & ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini & reseruato, vtrumque saluum est, & participatio Sacrificij & executio officij.

Will not thy statio (or fast) *be more solẽne if thou assist at Gods alter? hauing receiued and reserued the body of our lorde both thone and thother is safe, as well the participatiõ of the sacrifice, as the executiõ of the office or duty.*

And againe declaring the custome of the Christians in his time. *De corona militiũ cap. 3.*

Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitijs, annua die facimus.

We offer for the dead: and for the birth daies (so vvere thẽ and are still called the feast daies of martirs) *vpon the yeeres daie or anniuersarie.*

S. Cyprian another African Doctor, Bishop of Carthage, and martir aboue 1300. and 50. yeares agoe, besides that vneuitable testimony before related hath this doctrine in the same epistle. *Cyprianus epist. 63. ad Cæcilium.*

Apparet Sanguinem Christi non offerri si desit vinum Calici: nec Sacrificium Dominicum legitima sanctificatione celebrari, nisi oblatio & Sacrificium nostrum respondeat passioni.

It appeareth that the blood of Christ is not offered, if wine be wanting to the chalice: nor yet that our lords Sacrifice is lawfully celebrated, vnles our oblation and Sacrifice answer to his passion.

And yet againe.

Sacerdos sacrificium verum & plenum tũc offert in ecclesia Deo patri, si sic incipiat offerre, secundum quod ipsum Christũm videat obtulisse.

The priest doth then offer to God the Father a true and full Sacrifice in the church, if he do so offer as he seeth Christ to haue offered.

Yea the vvhole epistle is such, as no man that readeth it can deny, but that S. Cipria did beleeue and teach a true, sensible, and externall Sacrifice, and consequetly a true and proper sacrificing priesthood, in the nevv lavv and church of Christ.

And in his epistle to the cleargy and people of Furnes he saith.

Epist. 66.

Episcopi antecessores nostri religiosè considerantes, & salubriter prouidentes censuerunt, ne quis frater excedens, ad tutelam vel curam clericum nominaret: ac si quis hoc fecisset, non offerretur pro eo, nec Sacrificium pro dormitione eius celebraretur. Neque enim ad altare Dei meretur nominari in sacerdotum prece, qui ab altare sacerdotes & ministros voluit auocare.

The Bishops our predecessors religiously considering and holsomely prouiding, haue ordained that if any brother departing this life, should make any clerke ouerseer or executor of his will, the offering should not be made for him, nor the Sacrifice celebrated for his departure. For he doth not deserue to be named at Gods alter in the praiers of the priests, that would withdraw the priests and ministers from the alter.

And

And the first coūcell of Nice celebrated almost 1300. yeares agoe, the authority vvherof vvas neuer reiected or denied by any but the damned Arians, saith.

Neque Canon neque consuetudo tradidit, vt qui offerendi potestatem non habent, is qui offerunt dent Corpus Christi

Neither Canon nor custome hath taught that those, who haue not the power to offer (speaking of deacōs) *should giue the body of Christ to those that offer* (to wit to priests.) Concil. Nicen. can. 18.

Eusebius, vvho liued at the same time, setting dovvne the history of the councell holden at Hierusalem vnder Constantine the great, saith.

Alij incruentis Sacrificijs & misticis consecrationibus diuinum numen placabant.

That some Bishops did adorne the solemnity with praiers and sermōs &c. other did appease or (propitiate) *God with vnbloudy sacrifices & misticall cōsecratiōs.* Euseb. de vita Constāt. li. 4. cap. 45. printed ad Geneua.

S. Cyrill Patriarch of Hierusalē 340. yeares after Christ, that is 1270. yeares agoe in his catechisticall sermons.

Deum benignissimum oramus vt super illa proposita Sanctum Spiritum emittat, vt panem quidem faciat Corpus Christi, vinum verò Sanguinem Christi. Omnino enim quod attigerit Spiritus Sanctus, hoc Sanctificatur & transmutatur. Deinde vero postquam confectum est spirituale Sacrificium, ille cultus incruentus: Super ipsa propitiationis hostia obsecramus Deū pro cōmuni ecclesiarū pace. Rogamus & inquā nos omnes,

We praie the most mercifull God, to send the holy ghost vpō the gifts proposed, that he may make the bread the body of Christ. and the wine the bloud of Christ. For that which the holy ghost toucheth is altogether sanctified and chaunged. And after that the spirituall Sacrifice is prepared the vnbloudy worship, (cult or seruice) *ouer the propitiatory hoste, we praie God for the commō peace of the church &c. And againe. We beseech the*

Cyrill. Hierosolimit. catech. mist. 5.

& hoc sacrificiū tibi offerimus, vt memineris etiā eorū qui ante nos obdormierunt: primum Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, Apostolorū, Martyrum, vt Deus orationibus illorum deprecationibus suscipiat preces nostras. Deinde pro defunctis Sanctis patribus & episcopis; deniq; pro omnibus eramus, qui inter nos vita functi sunt, maximum esse credentes animarum iuuamen pro quibus offertur precatio Sācti illius & tremendi quod in altari positum est, Sacrificij.

and we offer vnto thee this Sacrifice in memory of those that are deceased before vs, Patriarches, Prophets, Apostles, Martirs, that God by their praiers and intercessiōs may receiue our praiers: then for the departed holy Bishops and Fathers, and to cōclude for all our brethren departed, beleeueing that the holy and dreadfull Sacrifice that is placed vpō the alter is a soueraigne helpe of those soules for which it is offered.

And yet againe.

Nos pro defunctis Christū pro nostris peccatis mactatū offerimus, vt & nobis & illis, eū qui est benignissimus, propitiū reddamus.

We offer for the dead Christ Sacrificed for our sinnes, that we may make him that is most mercifull, appeased (or propitious) both to vs and them.

And so many most notable things hath this holy Father in the same place, as well for the declaratiō of this point, and diuers others of Catholique doctrine, as also for the encrease of true piety, that I could wish he were read & vnderstood of all mē. S. Epiphanius in his epistle to Iohn Bishop of Hierusalē succeſſor to S. Cyrill, vvhich is translated by S. Hierome aboue 1200. yeare agoe, and is amongst his epistles the 60.

Cū vidissem quia multitudine sanctorum fratrū in monasterio cōsisteret, & Sancti presbyteri Hieronimus & Vincentius propter verecundiā & humilitatē

Whē I saw a great nūber of holy brethrē in the monastery, and that the holy priests Hierome and Vincēt for modesty and humility would not exercise the

nollent

nollent debita nomini suo exercere sacrificia, & laborare in hac parte ministerij, quæ Christianorum præcipua est salus &c.

sacrifices beloging to their title, and trauell in that part of the ministry, which is the principall safety (marke this) the principall safety of Christians.

S. Gregory of Nisse brother to the great S. Basil, whō S. Gregory Nazianzen calleth child of light, and man of God, vvho liued 1200. and 30. yeares agoe deliuereth the Catholique doctrine, of the Sacrifice of the nevv testament in these memorable vvords.

Gregor. Nissē orat de resurrectione.

Memēto Dominici dicti, nullus tollit animā meā, sed ego pono eā à meipso. Hoc mihi stet fixum, & quæstio de triduo mortis fuerit explicata. Nā qui omnia propotestate, atq; authoritate administrat, nō expectat ex proditione necessitatē vel Iudæos grassantes, vel Pilati iudicium iniquum, vt illorum hominū scelus ac malitia principium esset salutis nostræ: sed pro ineffabili arcanoque, & qui ab hominibus cerni nequit, sacrificij modo, sua dispositio ne præoccupat impetū violentum, & sese oblationē offert pro nobis, simul sacerdos & agnus qui tollit peccata mundi. Sed dicet mihi quando hoc accidit? Tum cum corpus suum ad manducandum, & sanguinem familiaribus præbuit ad bibendū. Homo enim

He who gouerneth all things by his power, and authority, doth not expect till he be betraied, nor the raging Iewes, nor the vniust sentence of Pilate, that the wickednes and malice of those men might be the beginning of our saluation. But by an vnspeakable and secret māner of sacrifice, which cannot be discerned of men, doth by his owne ordinaunce preuent their violent force, and offereth himself a Sacrifice for vs, being both the priest and the lambe, that taketh awaie the sins of the world. But thou wilt saie to me: when happened this? Then, when he gaue to his domesticks his body to eate, and his blood to drinke. For a man cannot eate the lambe enim

enim vesci non potest, nisi mactatio processerit. Qui igitur dedit discipulis suis Corpus ad manducandum, aperte demonstrat iam perfectam & absolutam esse agni immolationem. Non enim ad edendum Corpus animatum victimæ esset idoneum. Iã ergo latẽter propotestate sua inuisibiliter, & ineffabiliter Corpus immolatũ erat.

vnles it be killed before. Therfore he, that gaue to his disciples his body to be eaten, doth euidently declare, that the Sacrifice of the lambe is already done and past: for the liuing body of the host is not fit to be eaten. Therfore euen then was his boby secretly, and inuisibly through his power offered.

And S. Gregory Nazianzẽ, for his singuler knowledge in diuinity surnamed the diuine, S. Hieroms maister, of the same age with S. Gregory of Nisse, compagnon in studies with his brother the great S. Basil.

Orat. 1. con. Iulian. Apostat.

Manus suas profanat (nefario scilicet sacrificiorum sanguine) *vt nimirum eas ab incruento Sacrificio, per quod nos Christo, ipsiusque passioni ex diuinitati communicamus, eluceret ac purgaret.*

Non iam aras à puritissimo & incruento Sacrificio nomen habentes, sceleſto sanguine contaminabunt.

He stained (saith he) *his hãds* (with the bloud of prophane sacrifices) *to that end that he might purge the frõ the vnbloudy Sacrifice, wherby we are made partakers of Christ, of his passiõ, & diuinity.* And againe. *They* (the gẽtiles) *will not now defile the alters, that take their names of the most pure and vnbloudy sacrifice with the detestable bloud* (of profane sacrific.

And in his apologeticall oration hauing declared what perfectiõ was required euẽ in the priests of the old law, he cõcludeth with these memorable words.

Hæc igitur cũ ego nosse, illudque insuper, neminẽ magno & deo, & sacrificio, & Pontifice, di-

Hauing knowne these things, and besides, that no man is worthy of the great God, and Sacri-

gnus

gnum esse nisi qui prius seipsum hostiam viuentem, sanctam exhibuerit, ac rationabile obsequium, gratum, atque acceptum ostenderit, Deoque Sacrificium laudis, ac Spiritum contritum obtulerit) quod solum Sacrificium, is qui omnia dedit, à nobis exposcit) quo tandem modo externum illud Sacrificium, illud magnorum mysteriorum antitypum, ipsi offerre auderem? aut quomodo Sacerdotis habitum & nomen subire?

fice and Bishops vnles he haue first giuen himself a liuely and holy offering to the same God, and presented him with a reasonable, gratefull, and acceptable seruice, and offered to God a Sacrifice of praise and a cõtrite hart (which only Sacrifice he that giueth all things doth require of vs,) (to vvit of that vve haue, or can giue him of our owne, for he doth not aske of vs the sacrifice of our goods and cattell as he did of the Iewes.) How could I dare to offer vnto him that externall sacrifice (marke this vvorde externall) that exẽplar of the great misteries? or how could I put on the coate and name of a priest?

S. Ambroise Bishop of Millaine 1220. yeares agoe besides the testimonies alleaged out of him before saith thus.

Ego mansi in munere, missã facere cepi. Dum offero, raptum cognoui à populo Castulum quẽdam, quem presbyterum dicerent Arriani; hunc autem in platea offenderant transeuntes. Amarissimè flere & orare in ipsa oblatione Deum cepi, vt subueniret ne cuius sanguis in causa ecclesiæ fieret.

I abode in mine office, & begũ to saie masse (that is his verie vord) whilest I offer I knew that the people had laid hãd vpõ one Castulus, which the Arriãs said was priest, who was foũd by mẽ passing through the streete. I begũ to weepe bitterly, and to praie vnto God in the very oblatiõ, that in the cause of the church there might not bee any bloud shedd. And

Epist. 14. ad Marcellam sororem.

And againe.

Vpō the psal. 38. and 9. verse.

Vidimus principem sacerdotum ad nos venientē, vidimus & audiuimus offerētē pro nobis sanguinem suum: sequamur vt possumus sacerdotes, vt offeramus pro populo sacrificium & si infirmi merito, honorabiles tamen sacrificio. Quia & si nunc Christus nō videtur offerre, tamē ipse offertur in terris, quādo Christi Corpus offertur.

We haue seene the chiefe priest come to vs, we haue seene and heard him offer his bloud for vs: let vs priests imitate him as we may, and offer sacrifice for the people, being honorable in sacrifice though small in merit. For though Christ be not now seene to offer, yee is he offered vpon earth, when the body of Christ is offerred.

And yet againe he prooueth the excellency of this mistery by these words of the canō of the holy masse.

Lib. 4. de Sacramētis cap. 6.

Memores gloriosissimæ eius passionis, ab inferis resurrectionis, & in cælum ascēsionis, offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiā, rationabilem hostiā, incruentam hostiam, hunc panem sanctum & Calicem vitæ æternæ: & petimus & precamur, vt hāc oblationē suscipias in sublimi altari tuo, per manus Angelorū tuorum sicut suscipere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abell & sacrificium patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ, & quod tibi obtulit sūmus sacerdos Melchisedech

Remēbring his most glorious passiō, resurrectiō frō hell, and ascēsiō into heauē we offer vnto thee this immaculate hoste, reasonable hoste, vnbloudy hoste, this holy bread, and chalice of life euerlasting, and we beseech thee to receiue this offering in the high alter by the hāds of thy Angels, as thou vouchsafest to receiue the gifts of thy iust seruāt Abell, the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and which the high priest Melchisedech offered vnto thee.

S. Optatus Mileuitanus an Africā author of the same antiquity with S. Ambrose writing against the Sacrilegious Donatists, who brake downe Gods alters, amongst many other sharpe and vehement reprehensions (which I wish thee diligēt reader to see thy selfe, being too long to relate here, and which are by so much more proper for our Protestants

teſtants, then they were for the Donatiſts, by how much more outragious they haue beene in pulling downe churches and alters then the Donatiſts euer were.)

Quid vobis fecerat Deus qui illic inuocari cõſueuerat? quid vos offenderat Chriſtus cuius illic per certa momenta Corpus & Sãguis habitabat? Quid vos offendiſtis etiam vos ipſi, vt illa altaria frãgeretis in quibus ante nos per lõga tẽporum ſpatia, ſacte vt arbitramini obtuliſtis? Apud Dominum Elias Propheta querelam deponit. His autem locutus eſt verbis quibus & vos inter alios ab ipſo accuſari meruiſtis Domine (inquit) altaria tua confregerunt.

What had God done vnto you) that was wõt to be praied vnto there (at the alters? wherin had Chriſt offended you, whoſe body and bloud for certaine times did dwell there? what had you done to your ſelues, that you ſhould breake in peeces thoſe alters, vpõ which you your ſelues long time before vs did holily as you thought offer? And a litle after. *Elias the Prophet cõplaineth to God in theſe words, wherwith you deſerue to be accuſed lord, (ſaith he) they haue brokẽ downe thine alters.*

Lib. 6. con. Parme adinitium.

S. Hierome who wrote aboue 1200. yeares agone ſaith thus.

Si laicus imperatur vt propter orationem abſtineant ſe ab vxorum coitu: quid de epiſcopo ſentiendum eſt, qui quotidie pro ſuis populique peccatis illibatas Deo oblaturus eſt victimas. Inuenimus ſacerdotem Abimalech de panibus propoſitionis noluiſſe prius dare Dauid & pueris ſuis, niſi eos audiſſet ab heri & medius tertius vacaſſe ab opere coniugali, & mundos eſſe à coniugibus ſuis.

If laie mẽ be cõmaũded to abſtaine from the cõpany of ther owne wiues to giue thẽſelues to praier, what ſhall we thinke of Bishops that ought euery daie to offer to God immaculate hoſtes for his owne and the peoples ſinnes? We find that the prieſt Abimelech would not a giue to Dauid and his cõpany of the loaues of propoſitiõ, had he not firſt vnderſtood that they had abſtained from their owne wiues frõ yeſterdaie and the daie before.

Commentar. in epiſt. ad Tit. cap. 1. 1. Cor. 7. 5.

1. Reg. 21.

Tantum interest inter propositionis panes & corpus Christi, quantum inter vmbram & corpora, inter imaginem & veritatem &c.

There is as much difference betwixt the loaues of propositiõ and the body of Christ, as there is betwixt the shadow & the body, betwixt the image & the truth, betwixt the figure & the thing figured.

S. Iohn Chrisostome vvho liued about 1200. yeares agoe besides diuers other sentences to the same purpose hath these expresse vvords.

Commentar. in. 10. cap. 1. epist. ad Corinth.

Hic in eo quod est horribilius & magnificẽtius, sacram cõstituit operationẽ, vt qui & ipsum mutarit Sacrificiũ, & pro cæde brutorum seipsum iußit offerri.

He hath here (to vvit in the new testamẽt) instituted the sacred actiõ in that vvhich is farre more dreadfull and magnificẽt, as he that hath chaũged the sacrifice, and for the immolatiõ of beasts hath cõmaunded himselfe to be offered.

Homil. 3. in epist. ad Philippenses par. morali.

Nõ frustra sũt hæc ab Apostolis legibus cõstituta, vt in veneradis inquã atq; horrificis mysterijs memoria eorũ fiat qui decesserunt. Nouerũt hinc multum ad illos lucri accedere, multum vtilitatis. Eo enim tempore cũ vniuersus populus stat manibus expãsis, ac cætus sacerdotalis, & illud horrorẽ venerationis plenũ intuetur Sacrificiũ, quomodo Deum nõ placabimus pro istis orantem.

Not vvithout cause haue the Apostles by lawes ordained that in the venerable and dreadfull misteries the dead should be remẽbred. They knew that thẽce they receiued much gaine and profit. For whẽ all the people hold vp their hãds, and the wholecõpany of priests, & that dreadfull sacrifice placed there, how shall we not appease God praying for them.

And S. Augustin that great light of the latine church of the same antiquity with S. Chrisostome Bishop of Hippoe in Africke saith.

Lib. 1. de anima & eius origine ca. 9.

Salua fide Catholica & ecclesiastica regula nulla ratione cõceditur vt pro nõ baptizatis cu-

Neither the Catholike faith nor the rule of the church doth permitt that the sacrifice of the bo-

iusliber

quilibet ætatis hominibus offeratur sacrificium corporis & sanguinis Christi.

Cum offerretur pro ea sacrificiũ pretij nostri, ita iuxta sepulchrũ posito cadauere, priusquam deponeretur, sicut fieri solet.

Orationibus vero Sancta ecclesia, Sacrificio salutari, & eleemosinis quæ pro eorum spiritibus erogantur non est dubitandum mortuos adiuuari, vt cum eis misericordiùs agatur à Domino, quam eorum peccata meruerunt.

Hoc enim à patribus traditum vniuersa? obseruat ecclesia, vt pro eis qui in corporis & sanguinis Christi communione defuncti sunt, cum ad ipsum Sacrificium loco suo commemorãtur, oretur, ac pro illis quoque id offerri commemoretur.

dy and bloud of Christ should be offered for those, that are not baptized of what yeares soeuer they are. And againe. *Whilst the sacrifice of our redẽptiõ was offered for her (* his mother *) her body being placed neere the graue before it was laid downe as the custome is.* And againe he saith. *It is not to be doubted that the dead are holpen by the praiers of the holy church, and the healthfull sacrifice and almes bestowed for their soules, that God may deale more mercifully with thẽ then their sinnes haue deserued. For this the whole church obserueth, as deliuered by traditiõ frõ the Fathers, to wit, that for those that are dead in the cõmuniõ of the body & bloud of Christ whẽ they are remẽbred in that sacrifice in their place they should be praied for, and that it should be declared that it is offered for them.*

Lib. 9. cõfessionum. cap. 12.

If thow desire good reader to see more testimonies of this great Doctor to this purpose, seé him in his booke of heresies in the heresies of Aerius. his 20. booke against Faustus cap. 21. his 10. booke de ciuit. Dei cap. 20. the 17. booke cap. 20. the 18. booke cap. 35. and the 22. booke and 8. cap. for my purpose will not permitt me to staie longer in him.

S. Cyrill Patriarch of Alexandria who died the yeare 444. in the explication of his 11. anathema or curse examined in the third generall councell where he was not

only present but president by Celestinus then Pope of Rome his appointment saith.

Sanctum, viuificum, incruẽtumque in ecclesiis sacrificium offerimus, corpus & pretiosum sanguinem, quæ proponuntur, non communis nobisque similis hominis esse credentes, sed magis tanquam viuificantis verbi proprium Corpus & sanguinem accipimus.

We offer the holy, life-giuing, and vnbloudy sacrifice in the churches, beleeuing that the body and pretious bloud which are proposed are not of an ordinary man, or of one like vs, but we receiue thẽ as the proper body and bloud of the word) that is of the sonne of God) *that giueth life to all things.*

S. Leo the great created Pope the 440. yeare after our Sauiours natiuity.

Epist. 81. ad Dioscorũ Patriarcham Alexandr.

Volumus vt cum solemnior festiuitas conuentum populi numerosioris indixerit & ad eam tamen fidelium multitudo conuenerit, quam recipere Basilica vna non possit, sacrificij oblatio indubitanter iteretur, cum plenum pietatis atque rationis sit, vt quoties Basilicam in qua agitur præsentia nouæ plebis impleuerit, toties sacrificium subsequens offeratur. Necesse est autem vt quadam pars populi sua deuotione priuetur si vnius tantum missæ more seruato, sacrificium offerre nõ possint, nisi qui prima diei parte cõuenerũt.

We will (saith he) *that whẽ the solemnity of the feast hath drawne together so many faithfull people that the church cannot receiue thẽ at once, that the oblatiõ of the sacrifice be without doubt reiterated or done againe: seeing all piety and reason will, that so oftẽ as the church is filled with new people, so often a new sacrifice be offered. For it must needes be that some part of the people be depriued of their deuotiõ, the custome of one only masse obserued, if they only that come first may offer the sacrifice.*

S. Fulgentius an African, made Bishop the yeare 504

504. and died 529. saith.

Dicis à nõnullis te interrogatũ de sacrificio corporis & sanguinis Christi, quod pleriq; soli patri existimãt immolari. Hãc etiam asseris hæreticorum esse quasi palmariam interrogationem.

Thou saist thou hast bene demaunded of by diuers cõcerning the sacrifice of the body & bloud of Christ, which many do thinke to be offered to the Father only; and saist that this is the printipall questiõ of the heretiques. Lib 1. ad Monimum.

And a litle after.

Cum ad patrem litantis destinatur intentio, sacrificij munus omni Trinitati vno eodemque offertur litantis officio.

Whẽ the intentiõ of the sacrificer is directed to the Father the gift of the sacrifice by one & the same act of the sacrificer is offered to the whole Trinity. Et Infra.

In the latter end of this age to wit the yeare 590. was S. Gregory the great chosen to sit in the seate of S. Peter, of whose doctrine cõcerning the sacrifice of the masse, and consequently of a true sacrificing priesthood in the church of Christ, there can be no more question made, then whether there was euer such a man in the world as S. Gregory. And from his time downeward to our owne daies is there lesse question of that matter. For he sent S. Augustin into England who with Christian religion brought in the holy sacrifice of the masse which from that time till Edward the sixt his raigne, hath euer continued there as is euident by all Kind of records. So that it remaineth cleare, that in Europe, Asia, and Africke, (that is) in all parts of the Christian world euer since the Apostles times. This doctrine hath bene cõmon and neuer impugned or gainsaied by any one of those vigilãt watchmen, and sentinells, who God from time to time according to his promise, hath set to watch ouer his church, and who haue not ouerseene, or let passe the least errour in faith, that since Christ his ascension into heauen hath sprung vp, but haue, assoone as it hath appeared or bene vttered, espied it, impugned it, and neuer desisted till they had driuen it downe to hell againe from whẽce it came, witnesse all the heresies that haue bene raised in all

Esaie. 62. 9.

See the answerable protestants apology for the Catholique faith, in the conclusion to the reader sect. 5.

in all parts of the Christian world since Symon Magus ouer whom S. Peter himselfe triumphed. This doctrine I saie hauing bene thus vniuersall both in respect of time and place, hath not bene impugned by any one before Martin Luther, who (as he confesseth himselfe, to his owne and all his followers eternall confusion receiued his instructions from the deuill for the purpose.

If the Sacrifice of the church had either bene practised in secret corners or that it had bene a matter either indifferent or of smallest moment, such as are not so well either instructed, or persuaded of Gods continuall care and watch ouer his church as they ought to be, might peraduenture thinke it a thing possible that it might creepe in and continue for some time. But being as it is, not only the publique seruice of all Christians, but that at the celebration wherof, all things that are to be published, are for the more solemne publication denounced, and besides is of that moment, as no act of Christian cult, worship, and religion is comparable to it, being a most expresse and direct act of idolatry (if it were not the true worship ordained by God) for the which God, iealous of his honour, hath from time to time so seuerely punished all nations as well Iewes as Gentils, this I saie being, I doe and dare boldly auouch, that it cannot be esteemed possible by any man, that hath the least dram of true iudgment, or knowledge of the foundation of Christian faith and religion, that it should haue bene practised so publikely, so vniuersally, and for so long time, (as alreadie appeareth by irreprooouable testimonies that it hath (without controlement and contradiction.

Now hauing sufficiently prooued, as I thinke, a sacrificing priesthood to be in Christs church, it remaineth that we satisfie such obiection, as our aduersaries make against the same. For as all other articles of Christian faith haue had, haue, or may haue arguments made against them, euen out of the scripture it selfe, so likewise hath this.

The Epistle of S. Paul to the Hebrewes, not truly vnderstood, is depraued by the Protestants in preiudice of this truth, and to their owne perdition as S. Peter saith, the rest of the scriptures, and namely

2. Petri. 3. 16.

namelie those of S. Paul are by the vnstable: that is such as will haue no other interpretation of them but their owne. Out of this epistle are drawne diuers arguments, against the holie sacrifice of the Masse, whihh may all be reduced to this forme.

19. The Apostle to the Hebrewes teacheth first, that the priest of the new testament is one onlie. Secondlie, that the host or sacrifice of the new testament is but one onlie. Thirdlie that the offering, or sacrificing of that one host in likewise but once performed, and not often iterated or repeated: All which seemeth directlie against the sacrifice of the Masse, which hath manie priests, manie hosts, or at lest the same host often offered. Further he teacheth, that the priest of the new law, is not only one, but such a one as hath no neede to offer for himselfe? That the host or sacrifice is so pretious, that it taketh awaie all sinne; And that the offering therof is so effectuall, that Gods people hath no more guilt of sinne. Which singuler degree of perfection in the priest, sacrifice, and offering of the same doth make, that there can be but one in each kind, as is said before; so that this latter argument is rather a reason and cause of the former, then anie new and distinct argument. All this is prooued by the expresse testimonies of the Apostle. In setting downe wherof I will obserue the order of the chapters, and not the order of the points here touched, wherunto they may be easely applied.

The other indeede were made priests being many, because by death they were prohibited to continue. But this for that he continueth for euer, hath an euerlasting priesthood, wherby he is able to saue also for euer, going by himselfe to God, alwaies liuing to make intercession for vs: who hath not necessity daily (as the priests) first for his owne sins to offer hosts, then for the peoples. For this he did once in offering himselfe. Hebr. ca. 7. 23. 24. 25.

By his owne bloud entered once into the holies, eternall redemption being found. For if the bloud of goates &c. how much more hath the bloud of Christ cleused our conscience from dead workes, to serue the liuing God. Cap. 9. 12. 13. 14.

Nor that he should offer himselfe often, as the high priest entereth into the holies, euery yeare in the bloud of others: otherwise he ought to haue suffered often from the beginning of the world: but now once in the consummation of the worlds, to the destruction of sinne, he hath appeared

Cap. 10. 1. 2. *by his owne hoſt. So alſo Chriſt was offered once to exhauſt the ſin of many. For the law hauing a ſhadow of good things to come, not the very images of the things: euery yeare with the ſelfe ſame hoſts which they offer inceaſſantly, can neuer make the comers thereunto perfect. Otherwiſe they ſhould haue ceaſed to be offered, becauſe the worshippers once cleanſed ſhould haue no conſcience of ſinne any longer.*

Cap. 10. 10. 11. 12. *In the which will, we are ſanctified, by the oblation of the body of* IESVS CHRIST *once. And euery prieſt indeed is ready daily miniſtring and often offering the ſame hoſtes, which can neuer take away ſins. But this man offering one hoſt for ſinns, for euer ſitteth on the right hand of God. For by one oblation hath he conſummated for euer them, that are ſanctified. But where there is remiſſion of theſe, now there is not an oblation for ſin.*

These are the paſſages, which our aduerſaries ordinarilie vſe, for the impugning of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe.

For the better vnderſtanding of the Apoſtles doctrine in this epiſtle, touching the ſacrifice of the new teſtamẽt, it is firſt to be obſerued: that he ſpeaketh not any one word directlie, and expreſlie of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, or holie Euchariſt, as eſpeciallie our aduerſaries muſt graunt, ſeeing they teach and beleeue, that there is no ſuch ſacrifice at all. If therfore they will proouc any thing againſt it out of this epiſtle, they muſt do it by conſequence and deduction only: which kind of arguing that it may be good and lawfull, the Apoſtles principall drift, and intent muſt attentiuelie be conſidered. For it is no lawfull arguing to inferre that vpõ any mans words, without which his meaning is otherwaies full and perfect: As for example Heluidius did falſlie, and hereticallie vpon theſe words: *And he knew her not till ſhe brought forth her firſt borne ſonne*: deduce, that the bleſſed virgin did not continue perpetuallie virgin, inferring more vpon the Euangeliſts words, then his meaning was to expreſſe, Math. 1. 25. as the Proteſtants do alſo by S. Pauls doctrine, in this point of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe.

It is ſecondlie to be obſerued, that the cheefe intent of the Apoſtle in this epiſtle is, to prooue the dignitie, and preheminẽce of our Sauiour Chriſts prieſthood, and the neceſſitie and efficacy of his ſacrifice, and oblatiõ vpõ the croſſe, againſt ſuch miſbeleeuing Iewes, as held and eſteemed the prieſthood and ſacrifices of Moiſes law, to be euerlaſting, vnchangeable, and ſufficie-

of themselues for the remission of sins, without respect or dependence of any other priesthood, or sacrifice to be instituted from whence they might haue their valour and force.

The Apostles cheefe intent therfore in this epistle being this, it no way pertained to his purpose, to treate of the sacrifice of the Eucharist. For this depending of the sacrifice vpon the crosse, which the Iewes, for whose instruction S. Paul wrote this epistle, did not yet beleeue, they could not profitablie be instructed therin, nor S. Paul but verie preposterouslie, could treat directlie therof. This being well kept in mind, it will easelie appeare, that the Apostles intent is not to speake any thing in this whole epistle against the sacrifice of the alter, and consequentlie that whatsoeuer our aduersaries would inferre therof to that purpose, they do it besides the meaning of the Apostle, and therfore can be of no force.

20. M. Fulke obiecteth, against this *that the Hebrewes, to whom the Apostle writeth, were Christians, and therfore could haue no such opinion of the sacrifices of the law, which no faithfull Iew had before the coming of Christ.* Wherby he would insinuate, that the Apostles intent could not be to proue, the necessitie of the sacrifice of the crosse. *Ad Hebraos 7. sect. 5. & cap. 10. sect. 4.*

But M. Fulke is either deceiued, or would deceiue. For S. Hierome deliuering not onlie his owne opinion, but the doctrine of his auncestors, which he also embraceth, saith; *that the Apostle wrote to the Iewes, that were not yet Christians, nor true beleeuers.* And that those, to whom or against whom the Apostle wrote, were of that opinion, that their sacrifices were of themselues sufficient, without any respect or relation to any other sacrifice, it is more manifest by S. Pauls owne words, euen in this place handled by M. Fulke, then can stand with his ignorance therin; and therfore doth he wittinglie, and wilfullie depraue the Apostles doctrine, and goe about to deceiue his reader. The Apostles words are these. *If then consummation was by the Leuiticall priesthood, (for vnder it the people receiued the lawe) what necessitie was there yet another priest to rise, according to the order of Melchisedech, and not to be called according to the order of Aaron?* And agine in the 10. chapter. *It is impossible, that with the blood of oxen and goates, sins should be taken away.* Is it not manifest hereby, that the Apostle disputeth *Epist. 126. ad Euagr.* Hebræis enim, id est, Iudæis persuadebat, non iam fidelibus, quibus passim prodere sacramentum. *Hebr. cap. 7. 11. Cap. 10. 4.*

against such, as taught the sacrifices of the law to be sufficient, for the consummation of our redemption, and remission of our sinnes? Certes it is ouer euident to be denied by any man, not depriued of cōmon sence. The Apostle therfore in this dispute, doth not so much instruct the Catholique beleeuing Iewes in their faith, as confute the errours, and falsities in their misbeleeuing countrimen, as all other Catholique Doctors, and pastors of Gods church doe, whilst they write in confutation of the newlie rising heresies.

Fulke. But he vrgeth farther, and demaundeth, *how the Apostle could omitt to speake of the sacrifice of the Masse, seeing as we say, his drift was to auouch the eternall fruite, and necessity of Christ his passion, wherof the sacrifice of the Masse dependeth?* An impertinent question: For as well might he aske, how the Apostle could omit to speake of the Eucharist, as it is a sacrament, and of all other mysteries of our religion, which he confesserh (and necessarilie) to depend vpon the passion of Christ. And which (I pray you) of all the holie writers doth explicate all the misteries of our faith at once, or in one place, though they haue dependēce thone vpon thother? If M. Fulke had bene but half as quicksighted in the search of the truth, as he was to impugne it, he would easilie haue found the reason, why the Apostle made no mention of the sacrifice of the Masse in this epistle. For the Iewes, to whom he wrote, beleeuing not the necessitie of Christs passion (as is noted before) it could not be conuenient, that the Apostle should instruct them in that other high misterie, which necessarilie required the beleefe of our Sauiours passion before. Which reason the Apostle himselfe doth clearelie insinuate, saying; *Of whom (Melchisedech) we haue great speach, and inexplicable to vtter: because you are become weake to heare. Not because the Apostle could not* (saith S. Hierome) *explicate that he would say, but because it pertained not to that time. For he spake to the Iewes not yet faithfull beleeuers, to whō he would eftsoones haue opened the mistery.*

Hebr. cap. 5. 11. Hieron. vbi supra.

Yet M. Fulke is not satisfied, but replieth, *that this reason is vaine, vnles we will confesse that there was no Masse said among them, since they were conuerted,* still running counter, taking the misbeleeuing Iewes for true Christians, and supposing their conuersion, before they were conuerted.

Yea but (saith he) *such as were conuerted, and had the sacrifice of*

the Masse amongst them, were necessarilie to be instructed in the ground of it out of the law and Prophets, as well as of the sacrifice of Christs passion: which if order required, to be first handled, yet reason would not, that the Masse should haue altogether bene omitted: yea thother being so handled as they could not see, what need they had of Masse, but rather should be brought into detestation of it, if euer before they had vsed it.

The conuerted and beleeuing Iewes were so well instructed, in the ground of the sacrifice of the Masse, out of the *a* law, which recordeth Melchisedechs oblation in bread and wine, and out of the *b* Prophets, which testifie our Sauiour Christ to be a priest of that order: *c* and that the time would come, when that their carnall sacrifices should cease, and a cleane oblation should be offered to God in all places, *And that there should be a daily sacrifice*, as they were so farre from being brought into detestation of it, (as M. Fulke seemeth to be by his more then Iudaicall incredulitie) that they saw it most conformable to holie scriptures, and perfectlie agreeing with the all consummating oblation of the crosse; as all other trulie beleeuing Christians haue also done euer since that time. And therfore is it more the false, *that the Apostle doth not only omit to speake of the sacrifice of the Masse, but doth speake much against it*, as M. Fulke impudentlie affirmeth. For he is not able to produce anie one approoued author for 1500. yeares after Christ, that euer found any such thing in this epistle. Is not he therfore more then impudent, that dare so peremptorilie father that vpon the holie Apostle, that none of those watchfull sentinels, whom God hath from time to time set to watch incessantlie ouer his church, could euer espie? but to leaue this forger of new fables to himselfe.

a *Genes.* 14.
b *Psal* 109.
c *Malachy* 1. *Dan* 11. 31. 12. 11.
In the same place.
Esay 62. 6.

21. It is thirdlie to be obserued, that the ancient fathers writing vpon this epistle, and explaning the Apostles doctrine therin, saw the same obiections, that the heretiques of these times now make out of it against the sacrifice of the Masse, and answered them aboue 1100. yeares agone. So farre are they from thinking, that the Apostle speaketh any thing therin, against this holie sacrifice. Is not it onlie consideration sufficient, to perswade anie reasonable vnderstanding, of the truth of the Catholique beliefe in this point? These fathers were as learned, and as zealous of Gods truth, as the Protestants are, (to say no more) and besides this aduantage they had aboue them, that they were

denoide of all passion, and partialitie against any party, liued manie hundreth yeares before this question was mouued, and therfore much more like to giue true iudgment therof. But let vs heare what they say.

S. Chrisostom and S. Ambrose, (for both these holie and ancient fathers haue the same saying, and almost the same termes in their commentaries vpon these words of S. Paul. *The law hauing a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of the things: euery yeere with the selfe same hosts, which they offer incessantly, can neuer make the comers therunto perfect. Otherwise they should haue ceased to be offered, because the worshippers once cleansed should haue no conscience of sinne any longer.*

Hebr. cap. 10. l. 2.

Vpon these vords I say thus write these holie fathers. *VVhat, do we not daily offer? we offer truly, but we renew the memory of his death. For we offer alwaies the same, not now another, but alwaies the same, and therfore is it for this reason one sacrifice. Because it is offered in many places, are there therfore many Christs? Not so, but one Christ, who is wholly there, and wholly here one body. Like as therfore he is offered in many places being one body, and not many bodies, so is he but one sacrifice.*

Marks that it is Christ that is dayly offered.

It is our high priest, that offered that sacrifice which cleanseth vs: and we now offer that, that then was offered, which cannot be consumed. This is done in remembrance of that which then was done. For he saith, do ye this in commemoration of me. VVe do not offer another host, as the high priest (of the old law) did, but alwaies the same, or rather we make a commemoration of that host and sacrifice (of the crosse.)

Why the Masse though oft repeated is but one sacrifice and how the same thing is offered therin that our Sauiour offered.

The like sayings haue other fathers of latter times as Theophilast, Oecumenius of the Greekes, and of the Latins Haymo, Remigius, and Paschasius.

Ad Hebraos cap. 10. fol. 9.

And Primatius who was S. Augustins scholler, answereth the same obiection in these words, as he is related by M. Fulke himselfe.

VVhat then shall we say? do not our priests the same thing daily, while they offer sacrifice continually? they offer indeede, but for the remembrance of his death. And because we sinne daily and neede daily to be cleansed, because he cannot now die, he hath giuen vs this sacrament of his body and bloud, that as his passion was the redemption, and absolution of the world: (marke) so also the oblation may be redemption and cleansing, to all that offer it in true faith, and haue a good intention.

So

So that it is cleare that the obiections, wherby the aduersaries of the Catholique truth thinke to ouerthrow, the holie sacrifice of Gods church, were forseene and answered aboue a thousand yeres, before our new maisters of reformation were heard of in the world.

22. And that the indifferent reader be not deceiued, by the tergiuersations of our aduersaries in this particuler, it is necessarie to beware of their cauilling shifts, which they vse to auoide these cleare testimonies of antiquitie. For because these fathers say, that the dailie sacrifice of the church is a commemoration, or remembrance of the sacrifice of the crosse, they would against their expresse words and meaning inferre that it is no true sacrifice. But by the same argument they maie also conclude, that all the sacrifices of the law of Moises were not trulie, and properlie sacrifices. For they all had the like respect to the same sacrifice of the crosse, that the sacrifice of the Masse hath, without any other difference at all, but that those, because they went before, did prefigurate or forshew it as being yet to come, and this of the Masse is a remembrance or commemoration of the same, as being now past: which difference can no way preiudice, or impaire the perfection, and true proprietie of a sacrifice in this latter, as is too too manifest. Therfore the respect of prefiguration in the sacrifices of Moises lawe, did not let or hinder them to be properlie sacrifices; the respect of commemoration, in the sacrifice of the Masse, cannot make it to be improperlie a sacrifice. But to come nearer the difficultie, and to declare the true meaning, and sense of the Apostle, in the speeches before related,

23. It is fourthlie to be obserued, that he disputing against the errour of those Iewes, that taught the priesthood, and sacrifice of Aarō to be so perfect and absolute of it selfe, that it sufficed (without respect to any other) to cleanse the professours of the law from all guilt of sinne, and to open vnto them the kingdome of heaue̅, as is before declared. He prooue̅th first the insufficiency of the priesthood, and sacrifice of the Leuiticall lawe, to take awaie any sinne at all of it selfe, and much more to discharge and redeeme all mankind from all sinnes, or to open vnto them the kingdome of heauen. This he diuinelie demonstrateth, first on the behalfe of the priests, who being sinners, themselues

a *Cap.* 7.27. 28. *cap.* 9.7. themselues had neede of a mediatour, and redeemer, as well as the people for whom they offered. Secondlie on the behalfe of b *Cap.* 9.9. *cap.* 10.4. the b sacrifice, which being but onlie the flesh and bloud of goates and calues, could not possible cleanse the soules of men from sinne, nor pacifie Gods wrath against them. Thirdlie on the behalfe of the c action of offering, which being so often repeated, c *Cap.* 7.19. *cap.* 10.1. 2.11. was manifestlie prooued of small or no force, for if it had bene effectuall, it should haue ceased, *for the worshippers once cleansed haue no more conscience of sinne.*

d *Cap.* 7. *from the* 11. *verse.* Haueing thus prooued the insufficiecie of the Leuiticall priesthood, and sacrifices to the effects before mentioned; he d inferreth the necessitie of another priesthood, and sacrifice, which should worke the consummation, that is, the vniuersall redemption of all mankind from all sinne, and the opening the gates of the heauenlie kingdome: And sheweth this priest to be our Sauiour Christ, and his passion to be the consummating sacrifice, declaring that in all the respects before mentioned, wherin e *Cap.* 7.26. f *Cap.* 9.12. *cap.* 10.10. g *Cap.* 9.25. 28 *cap.* 10. 10, 12, the leuiticall priesthood was defectiue, this is most perfect. e *His person being most innocent, impolluted, separated from sinners, and made higher then the heauens.* f *His sacrifice not the flesh and bloud of beasts: but his owne body and bloud.* and the g action of sacrificing, or offering but once performed or done, being so effectuall that it needed not to be repeated any ofterer.

This being the principall intent, and purpose of S. Paul in this dispute of our Sauiours priesthood, and sacrifice (as will euidentlie appeare to all that read him with indifferencie and attention) neither his words, nor meaning can with truth, and reaso be vrged against the sacrifice of the Masse, or any other sacrifice not supposed, or pretended to be sufficient of it selfe for the cleasing of sinne, and redeeming of man from the same, whereas against such a sacrifice his reasons are inuincible, and would conclude as effectuallie against the sacrifice of the Masse, if it were maintained to be a propitiation of mens sins absolutelie of it selfe (without respect or dependence of the sacrifice of the crosse) as they do against the leuiticall sacrifices, falslie maintained by the Iewes to haue bene such. But because no Catholique Christian euer dreamed, that the sacrifice of the Masse should be such a consummating, redeeming, and independent sacrifice, as the Apostle here speaketh of, and as the misbeleeuing

uing Iewes eſteemed theirs to be, the Apoſtles diſcourſe maketh no more againſt it, then it doth againſt the ſacrifices of Moiſes lawe, euen in thoſe verie times, when they were appointed by God himſelfe to be vſed, as ſhall by and by be clearely deduced.

In the meane while it is to be noted, that there are two ſorts of ſacrifice (I ſpeake onlie in reſpect of their efficacie, for in other reſpects there are diuers ſorts:) thone abſolute and indepēdēt, hauing effect and efficacie of it ſelfe, without reſpect or dependence of anie other, and maie be called cōſummatiue or redemptiue: thother reſpectiue and dependent, which hath not efficacie of it ſelfe to remit ſinnes, or of it proper inſtitution, but from another and maie be called applicatiue, becauſe it applieth the efficacie, and valour of another to ſuch effects, as it is ordained vnto. Amongſt all the ſacrifices that euer were, either in the law of nature, of Moyſes, or of Ieſus Chriſt, that onlie of the croſſe is of the firſt kind; all the reſt (yea that of the Maſſe) are of the ſecond ſort. For all true Chriſtians did, and do beleeue and confeſſe, that the holie ſacrifice of the Maſſe hath the whole efficacie, and vertue, which it hath, as it is propitiatorie, from the ſacrifice of the croſſe. And in this reſpect dependeth no leſſe therupon, then the Iewes ſacrifices did: though in reſpect of the perfection as well of the cheefe prieſt, as of the hoſt or thing offered (both being our Sauiour Chriſt himſelfe) and conſequentlie of the greater vertue it hath, to applie vnto vs the merites of Chriſt his paſſion, this doth incomparablie exceede thothers, as S. Chriſoſtom before cited doth euidentlie teach. *Supra n. 17.*

This diſtinction of an abſolute, independent, redeeming, or conſummating ſacrifice, and of a reſpectiue, dependent, and applying ſacrifice, our aduerſaries muſt neceſſarilie confeſſe, and acknowledge to be good and allowable, malgree all their malice againſt the ſacrifice of the Maſſe: vnles they will either wholie exclude all the ſacrifices of the old lawe, from the nūber and nature of true ſacrifices, or ſay they were redeeming and independent ſacrifices, neither of which extreames they will dare to auouch.

14. This doctrine therfore of theſe two diuers ſorts of ſacrifice being neceſſarily allowed, it will eaſelie be ſhewed, that the ſame argumēts, that our aduerſaries make out of the Epiſtle of

S. Paul, against the sacrifice of the Masse, haue the same force against the Leuiticall sacrifices, and if they conclude that to be superstitious, and idolatricall, they will conclude the same of these, euen for the time they were approoued by God, and therfore ought not onlie now to cease, but neuer to haue bene instituted, or practised. And farther, that all the reasons, that prooue the sacrifices of the Leuiticall law to haue bene good and holie, notwithstanding the necessitie and efficacie of the sacrifice of the crosse, do prooue the verie same of that of the Masse. This difference onlie being, that they prefigurating Christs passion as going before it, are now necessarilie ceased: This commemorating or renuing the memorie of the same as coming after it, being to continue so long as the new testament, (which is established and dedicated in it, our Sauiour saying. *This is my bloud of the new testament,*) shall last, which shalbe to the worlds end.

Math 26.28

Hebr. cap. 10.14.18. The doctrine of S. Paul in this epistle cānot otherwise be vrged against the sacrifice of the Masse: then, for that *by one only oblation one offered, the high priest of the new testament Christ Iesus hauing consummated for euer the sanctified: there can remaine no more sacrifice for sinne, because the worshippers once cleāsed, they haue no conscience of sinne any more.*

Cap. 10.2. But all this may in the same māner be vrged, against the sacrifices of the old law, as it is against the Masse, and prooueth as much against thone, as against thother. For this self same one onlie sacrifice once offered vpon the crosse, by Christ Iesus the high priest of the new testamēt, was offered as well for the sinnes committed vnder the Leuiticall lawe, as for those that were cōmitted since the abolishing of the same, S. Paul expreslie saying, *that our Sauiour died for the preuarications, which were vnder the former lawe.* And our aduersaries dare not deny, but that all the sinnes remitted since the beginning of the world, haue bene remitted by vertue of this one onlie sacrifice vpon the crosse; and not onlie that, but that this one sacrifice is the consummation of all sanctitie giuen to men, and all worship giuen to God by all the former sacrifices. If therfore the argument before alleaged, prooue the sacrifice of the Masse to be superstitious or none at all, it will also prooue the same of all those sacrifices, that haue bene since the beginning of the world. And the selfe same reason that maketh the sacrifices of the law of nature, and Moses

Hebr. 9.15.

(being not onlie true ſacrifices, but propitiatorie in their degree, euen for thoſe ſinnes that were to be taken awaie by the ſacrifice of the croſſe) to be good and lawfull (notwithſtanding that the conſummation of thoſe worshippers was to be made, by that one onlie ſacrifice of the croſſe) doth prooue the ſame of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe.

If it be ſaid that the ſacrifice of the croſſe, wherby the conſūmation is wrought, being not yet offered, there might be diuers iuſt reaſons for the inſtitution and vſe of other ſacrifices, ſuch as were in the law of nature, and of Moiſes: But that ſacrifice being now finiſhed, all thoſe reaſons ſeeme to ceaſe, and conſequentlie all ſacrifices to be abolished: It is impertinent; For either thoſe reaſons, making for the inſtitution of other ſacrifices in the former lawes, were repugnant to the vertue, and efficacie of the conſummating ſacrifice of the croſſe, or they were not. If they were, they could not iuſtifie the inſtitution and vſe of anie ſuch ſacrifices. If they were not (as manifeſtlie they were not) the ſame may be ſaid of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, which hath no more repugnance with the ſacrifice of the croſſe, then thoſe other ſacrifices had. For that accidentarie circumſtance of time, by reaſon wherof the old ſacrifices went before the all conſummating ſacrifice of the croſſe, and the ſacrifice of the Maſſe cometh after it, maketh no ſuch difference betweene them, that by reaſō therof thone may be good and lawfull, and thother vnlawfull: becauſe the vertue and efficacie of the ſacrifice of the croſſe, did reach to all the time as well going before it, as following after it: It being that ſacrifice, wherin was offered the lābe, which in *Gods* preordinatiō was ſlaine before the beginning of the world, and in reſpect and regard wherof all ſacrifices were acceptable to God, as being foūded in the valour and merit thereof.

25. If it be demaunded, why then are theſe ſacrifices aboliſhed and taken away, and another inſtituted, if there be no difference betweene them, by reaſon of that circumſtance of time, they going before the conſummating ſacrifice, thother following after? I anſwere they are not abolished for any repugnance, that a true and propitiatorie ſacrifice (whether it go before or follow after) hath with the onlie redeeming ſacrifice of the croſſe. For by that reaſon they ſhould not onlie haue ceaſed, but ſhould neuer haue bene inſtituted,

as is shewed before. But they are abolished for two reasons amongst others. First they were figures, and shadowes of that which was to come, as is confessed of all Christians, and therfore the truth wherof they were shadowes appearing, it was necessarie they should cease, and vanish away.

Secondlie becauſe of their groſſenes and imperfection, which fitted not the ſtate of the new teſtament, for which God of his infinite goodnes, and wiſdome had prouided better promiſes, and therfore inſtituted a ſacrifice for this time, in ſubſtance the verie ſame with that vpon the croſſe, though in māner and externall forme different from it. Which albeit in perfection and excellencie, it doth as farre exceede the ſacrifices of the former lawes, as the bodie and bloud of Chriſt our Sauiour doth exceede that of calues and goates, yet hath it ſome reſemblance with them in two other reſpects.

Thone, that as thoſe ſacrifices had relation to the ſacrifice of the croſſe, and depended thervpon in regard of their effect; ſo doth alſo the ſacrifice of the Maſſe. For it is not an abſolute and independent ſacrifice, as that was vpon the croſſe, neither doth it redeeme vs from ſinne, nor purchaſe vnto vs grace, otherwaies then by applying vnto vs the fruite, valour, and effect of the bloudie ſacrifice vpon the croſſe; as alſo the other ſacrifices of the former lawes did in a certaine degree, but not in ſuch perfect and ample manner, nor *ex opere operato*, or of worke it ſelf as this doth.

Thother, as they did prefigurate, or foreſhew the ſacrifice of the croſſe as going before it: ſo this doth renew the memorie, of the ſame being now paſt, as S. Paul teſtifieth, ſaying. *So often*
1. Corinth. 11 *as you ſhall eate this bread, and drinke this cupp, you ſhall declare the death of our Lord.*

Farther it is to be obſerued, that if our aduerſaries will take awaie the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, prereding that it doth derogate from the merit, dignitie, and ſufficiencie of Chriſts paſſion, of wich the ſcripture ſaith, *that it alone hath conſummated all the ſanctified*: they muſt alſo for the ſame reaſon take awaie the ſacramēnts of the Euchariſt, and of baptiſme, and which is more, euen their iuſtifying faith. For all theſe do no leſſe derogate, from the perfect conſummation of our redemption, wrought by the ſacrifice of the croſſe (being neceſſarie for the effectuall

&uall applying of the merite, valour, and effect therof vnto vs) then doth the ſacrifice of the Maſſe. For if they will that euerie meane, wherby the merit of Chriſts paſſion is applied vnto vs, though it haue this verie applicatiue power from the paſſion of Chriſt, doth derogate from the ſufficiencie therof, then muſt they neceſſarilie ſaie, that the aforeſaid ſacraments, and alſo faith it ſelf do derogate from it, not otherwaies profiting vs then by applying vnto vs, thoſe graces and bleſſings, which Chriſt by his paſſion merited for vs. But of the contrarie part, if they will admit ſome other meane, diſtinct from Chriſts paſſion, to applie vnto vs the merites therof without derogating from it (as all Chriſtians doe and muſt) then haue they no reaſon at all, for that reſpect, to denie the ſacrifice of the Maſſe.

26. And that the carefull reader may ſee, that by this doctrine of our aduerſaries againſt the ſacrifice of the church, is erected that abomination of deſolatiō, wherupon followeth the taking awaie of the dailie ſacrifice, fortold by the Prophet Daniel, he may obſerue with deteſtation, that nothing in Atheiſme it ſelfe can be more impious, then by the triūphant croſſe of Chriſt and his bitter paſſion, the firme and immouable rocke of all true religious worſhip, to take awaie from the new law that onlie worſhip of ſacrifice, which euer euen by the light of nature, hath bene with all true worſhippers properlie due, to the eternall power of Gods maieſtie. *Dan. 12. 11.*

Thus is not onlie prooued a truly ſacrificing prieſthood, to be in the church of Chriſt, but alſo are ſatisfied the cheefeſt obiections againſt it, wherupon it clearelie followeth, that the pretended Biſhops that ſucceeded M. Parker, and the reſt promoted with him vntill this day, (of whom the queſtion is in this chapter) being no true prieſts, could be no true Biſhops, as is before irreprooūablie ſhewed, and therfore haue ſuch an eſſentiall defect in their calling, more thē the others had, that though their predeceſſors had bene true Biſhops, as they were not, yet theſe could be none. *Concluſion.*

But now to conclude them all in one, and the ſame damnation: I ſay, that though euerie one of the arguments brought here againſt the Biſhops of England, ſince Cranmers fall into hereſie, ſhould not demonſtrate them not to be lawfull Biſhops

and Paſtors, yet all of them together cannot but make a cleare demõſtration therof, which may be framed in this ſort.

27. Thoſe Bishops whoſe calling and conſecration is iuſtlie, and with good reaſon doubted to be eſſentiallie defectiue, and they therfore to be no Bishops, but meere vſurpers of that title, are euidẽtlie no lawfull and canonicall Bishops. But ſuch are all the proteſtant Bishops in England, ſince Cranmers reuolt, and apoſtacie from the Catholique Romane faith and religion.

Therfore are they euidentlie no lawfull, and canonicall Bishops.

The firſt propoſition of this argument is euidentlie prooued diuers waies.

Firſt by this example. No ciuill Magiſtrate, be he iudge, lieutenant, Embaſſadour, or other officer whatſoeuer, who is iuſtly and vpon good reaſon doubted to haue no ſuch authoritie, but is ſuſpected vpon good groũd to be a counterfeite, vſurper, and deceiuer, is ſo euidentlie no lawfull magiſtrate, that whoſoeuer ſhould obay him in his pretended office, ſhould therby commit an act of rebellion againſt his ſoueraigne, who ſendeth no magiſtrates to his ſubiects, but with cleare and vndoubted warrant. For to a lawfull magiſtrate is not onlie required, that the haue authoritie, but alſo that he haue a cleare and euident *conſtat* or proofe that he hath authoritie. Therfore much more are they no lawfull Bishops, or eccleſiaſticall magiſtrate, who are in like manner doubted to haue no ſuch authoritie, and power: I ſay much more: becauſe as the harme, and inconuenience which would follow of ſuch abuſes in the Eccleſiaſticall gouernement, is farre greater, and leſſe remediable, then that which might ariſe by the ſame in the temporall ſtate, ſo is the prouiſion to auoide it greater, and more eaſie, by his prouidence who is ſoueraigne gouernour therof.

28. Secondlie, the magiſtrates in all cõmon wealths, and kingdomes, are alwaies ſo euidẽtly, and clearelie knowne to be ſuch, that no reaſonable doubt may be made of their power and cõmiſſiõ. And it is neceſſarie it ſhould be ſo. For other waies whatſoeuer they ſhould doe in their office, ſhould be doubtfull and vncertaine, and cõſequentlie would bring all things to ſtrife and confuſion, then which nothing can be more pernitious. Therfore thoſe magiſtrates, that are iuſtlie and reaſonablie doubted

to

to be none at all, cannot be any lawfull magistrates. This reason holdeth *à fortiori* in Bishops, who are Ecclesiasticall magistrates and gouernours. And so the first proposition of the former argument remaineth euidentlie prooued: to wit, that those Bishops whose calling is iustlie doubted to be essentiallie defectiue, and they therfore to be no Bishops but meere vsurpers, are euidentlie no lawfull Bishops.

The second proposition is euident by that, which hath hitherto bene said, against the calling of our English Bishops, and maie cleerelie be concluded in this manner. The calling of those Bishops is iustlie doubted to be essentiallie defectiue, which is manifestlie doubtfull both on the part of the callers, called, and calling; but such are the Bishops in England, as appeareth before. *ergo.*

Secondlie their calling is iustlie doubted to be essentiallie defectiue, (that is, to be none at all) for the proofe of the sufficiēcie wherof nothing can be said, that maie not as trulie be alleaged for their calling, who are euidentlie and confessedlie knowne to be no Bishops, as the Arians, Nouatians, Nestorians, Pelagiās, and the rest of the old condemned heretiques. But such is the calling of the Bishops in England. *ergo.*

Thirdlie their calling in iustlie doubted to be essentiallie defectiue, which hath no instance or example of the like, in the whole Christian church, for aboue 1500. yeares after Christ.

But such is the calling of the Bishops in England. *ergo*, And so remaineth prooued the second proposition of the former argument, and cōsequentlie the conclusiō must necessarilie be true, to wit that the Bishops of England descended from Cranmer since his reuolt from the Catholique church, are euidentlie no lawfull Bishops.

29. Wherupon I farther inferre, that the pretended church of England is no true church, and consequentlie the faith and religion therof to be no true faith and religion.

For where there are no true Pastors and Bishops, there can be no true church, as all our aduersaries confesse, and it is of it selfe euident, *the church* (as S. Cyprian saith) *being in the Bishop, and the Bishop in the church, or otherwise the church is the flocke vnited with the Pastor, and Pastor with the flocke*: and where there is no true church, there *Epist. ad Flor.*

there can be no true faith and religion; the true church being *the house of God, the piller and grounde of truth*, (as S. Paul testifieth) and our aduersaries deny not. Now where there is no true faith, how can there be any meanes of saluation? seeing that *without faith it is impossible to please God*, as teacheth expresse S. Paul.

Ad Timoth.

Ad Hebr. 11.6.

Marke well (I beseech thee iudicious reader) this cleare deduction, and if thou be a Protestant, and professour of the English religion, see which maie thou canst auoide it with the contentment, and satisfaction of thine owne conscience.

And if thou find the meane to do it, set downe thy conceptions clearlie, and without wilfull wrangling, and thou shalt (God willing) haue a satisfying replie. If thou canst not, (as if thou laie aside wilfull obstinacie, which hindreth the sight of all truth, I thinke thou canst not) returne quicklie to the vnitie of Gods Catholique church, and be not so grosselie and inexecusablie deceiued, as to thinke to find thy saluation in that congregation, which hath no true Pastors, and consequentlie neither true church, true faith, nor true religion.

The eightteenth Chapter.

That neither the present superintendets in England haue, nor their Protestant predecessours euer had anie lawfull Episcopall Iurisdiction.

1. HAVING thus farre shewed the pretended Bishops in England, promoted to bishoprikes since Cranmers reuoult from the vnitie of the Catholique Romane church, and lapse into heresie in Edward the 6. his raigne, to haue wanted the true power of order, it now remaineth to shew, that they want also the lawfull power of iurisdiction; whence it will follow, that they haue nothing belonging no true Bishops,

sauing

ſaining the poſſeſſion of the temporall liuings, and the bare name of Bishops. For the whole eccleſiaſticall power being diuided into the power of order, and iuriſdiction, as M. Field, and M. Carleton with all Catholiques truly confeſſe, if they be found to want both, they can haue nothing pertaining to true Bishops.

Field of the church. l. 3. c. 29. Carleton of iuriſdiction pag. 7.

That the power of iuriſdiction is neceſſarilie required, to the lawfull calling of eccleſiaſticall miniſters, and paſtors of Gods church, is without all controuerſie graunted, and confeſſed of all parties, aſwell proteſtants as Catholiques: and the queſtion here is onlie, whether our English Intendents haue any ſuch lawfull iuriſdiction or no. Which queſtion that we maie diſpute more clearlie, and fitly for the capacity of euery one, it wilbe neceſſary brieflie to declare, both what iuriſdiction is in generall, what parts it hath, and of what kind of iuriſdiction we are here to treate.

What iuriſdiction is.

It is firſt therfore to be vnderſtood, that though this word (iuriſdiction) ſoundeth only deliuerie of the law, or denouncing of iudgment, or ſentence in matters of iuſtice, yet is it both here, and ordinarily euery where taken for the power it ſelfe that one man hath ouer others, not only in matter of lawe and iuſtice, but in all other manner of rule, gouernment, or dominion: ſo that in this large ſignification parents may be ſaid to haue iuriſdictiō ouer their children, maiſters ouer their ſeruants, Kings and ſoueraigne Lords ouer their ſubiects and vaſſalls, and Bishops or paſtors ouer their flocke and charge.

Secondly it is to be vnderſtood, that iuriſdiction in the firſt and proper ſignification is two fold, Spirituall, which is alſo called eccleſiaſticall, to which belongeth the gouernment, charge, diſpoſition, and adminiſtration of all thoſe Spirituall helpes and meanes, which our Sauiour Chriſt hath left in his church, for the farthering of man to his eternall ſaluation, as are Gods holy word, and his Sacraments, and thoſe actions and things that belong therunto, wherof S. Paul ſpeaketh when he ſaith. *Let a man ſo eſteeme vs as miniſters of Chriſt, and diſpenſers of the miſteries of God*: and temporall or ſeculer, which gouerneth and commaundeth in matters pertaining to mens temporall weale, and proſperity; as to miniſter iuſtice in cauſes ciuill and criminall, and to commaund that which is iuſt and honeſt in all occa-

1. Corinth. 4. 1.

sions, and occurrences of the common wealths, and to forbid the contrarie. Either of these kinds of iurisdiction may be yet farther diuided, into directiue, and coactiue, or coercitiue. The directiue maketh lawes, and giueth precepts guiding men to that end, for the attaining wherof the iurisdiction is ordained, which, if it be spirituall, is life euerlasting: if temporall, is the peace and prosperitie of the common wealth, and of euerie particular person as member of the same. The coercitiue compelleth men by penalties, and punishments, to the obseruaunce aswell of the same lawes and constitutions, as also of those prescribed by God and nature, and therfore is well tearmed coercitiue.

Thirdlie it is to be vnderstood, (that leauing apart the temporall, or secular iurisdiction, as not pertaining to our purpose) we speake here onlie of spirituall, or Ecclesiasticall, which either administrateth matters immediatlie pertaining to the soule, and conscience, without respect to the externall or contentious court, as to preach and minister sacraments, and therfore is called of some internall; or examineth, heareth, and determineth, in the externall and contentious court, such cases and causes, as arise amongst men, by the transgressions of the prescripts, and prohibitions of the Ecclesiasticall superiour, and what other causes els are knowne to belong to the Ecclesiasticall tribunall, and this is called also by some externall.

That the spirituall iurisdiction hath all these parts or members, not onlie in the Catholique, but also in the protestants doctrine, it is euident by their owne practices: For besides their preaching and ministring sacraments, which appertaineth to the internall iurisdiction, they haue their externall and contentious courts, where by Ecclesiasticall power they iudge, trie, and determine, without recourse to the temporall court, verie manie causes, and especiallie such as arise by the vndue ministring of the sacraments, or other holie actions: in which cases they exercise both directiue, and coercitiue iurisdiction. I haue seene a printed booke intituled thus.

Articles to be inquired of within the diocesse of Chicheſter, in the second generall visitation of the R.d father in God, Lancelot Bishop

Bishop of Chichester, holden in the yeere 1609. contayning 79. Articles, with the forme of an oath to be ministred to the church wardens, and sworne men; which (if it were not cleare otherwise) doth shew, that they pretend to haue all these kinds of spirituall iurisdiction here mentioned.

This therfore being cleare, the question is, whether our pretended Bishops in England haue indeede any such iurisdiction, as by their practise they pretend to haue, or no. And they are prooued not to haue anie such in this sort. *The question.*

Of themselues, and as they are men, they haue no such iurisdiction, for all men, as they are men, are equall, and neither subiect nor superiour one to another, as is euident, neither haue they it from anie other (as shalbe prooued) therfore haue they it not at all.

2. That I maie prooue that they haue no iurisdiction from any other, and with the same labour refute M. Masons shifts in this point, thou art (iudicious reader) to vnderstand, that he, being driuen therunto by miserable necessitie, patcheth vp for their Bishops a iurisdiction of two parts: one wherof he saith they haue from Christ himselfe, thother from the Prince. *Mason fol. 143.*

But what part it is, that they receiue from the Prince, neither doth M. Mason tell vs, nor is it easie to gather either out of his owne or his fellowes doctrine. For from the Prince they cannot receiue that iurisdiction, which the Prince hath not to giue, as is euident: but the Prince hath neither that part of iurisdiction, which is called internall, consisting in the administration of Gods holie word and sacraments, as the articles of their religion do expreslie declare.

Neither hath he the externall coercitiue iurisdiction, consisting principallie in inflicting the censure of excommunication, suspension, and the like. For M. Mason sheweth out of *Tortura Torti*, that the Prince hath not this iurisdiction: *Nos Principi censuræ potestatem non facimus*: saith he, that is, *we giue not the Prince power of inflicting censures*. And M. Carleton saith the same in most expresse words hereafter cited. *Article 37.* *Tort. tort. pag. 151.* *Carleton of iurisdict. pag. 9. 10.*

Neither hath he the directiue iurisdiction, consisting in the power to make canons and constitutions, for the giuding and directing of ecclesiasticall ministers, in the due ministerie of the Sacraments, and of the people to receiue the same, and other actions pertaining to the charge of pastors. For this is meerely a Spirituall power (as the Sacraments, to the due administration and vse wherof, this power appertaineth, are also Spirituall) and therfore cannot belong to the Prince, in the Protestants doctrine. *VVe giue* (saith M. Carleton) *all Spirituall power to the church*: And againe. *The Spirituall gouernment of the church is committed to Spirituall gouernors: as first from Christ to his twelue Apostles: from them to Bishops, and Pastours, their successours.* And yet againe. *As for Spirituall iurisdiction of the church, standing in examinations of controuersies of faith, iudging of heresies, deposing of heretiques, excommunication of notorious and stubborne offenders, ordination of priests and deacons, institution and oblation of benefices, and Spirituall cures &c. this we reserue entire to the church, which Princes cannot giue, or take from the church.*

Pag. 4. *Pag. 5. 6.* *Pag. 9.*

And to strenghthen M. Carletons authoritie with an euident reason. If the Prince had this Spirituall directiue iurisdictiō, he should also consequently haue, the compulsiue, or coercitiue of inflicting censures, which proceedeth from directiue as necessarily requisite, that it may take effect. But this kind of power the prince hath not, as is already shewed out of their owne doctrin: Neither therfore hath he thother. What part therfore or kind of iurisdiction, the Bishops and Pastours of Gods church, can receiue from the temporall Prince, euen in the Protestants doctrine I see not: Neither can M. Mason, or any other for him shew it. And therfore his doctrine of a Spirituall iurisdiction (for of Spirituall iurisdiction he speaketh) partly receiued frō the Prince, is euidently false.

Torturs Torti. pa. 151.

For though the prince haue power to make lawes, wherby the contumacious, and obstinate contemners of ecclesiasticall canons and censures, may be by corporall penalties compelled, to the due obseruance of the iust, and profitable constitutions of their lawfull pastors (which power both M. Mason, and M. Carleton call externall coercitiue iurisdiction) yet is this power so farre from being soueraigny aboue that of the church, or that the churches iudgmēts depend therupon, that it is euidently subordinate therunto, and therfore doth not intermeddle with any such

such delinquent, till the Spirituall iudge hath declared him incorrigible by ecclesiasticall meanes, and therfore leaueth him in the hands of the temporall magistrate, to proceed with him according to the temporall lawes, enacted for such offenders.

And for the auoiding of all cauills, and intermedling with questions not pertaining to the present purpose, I would haue it noted, that I speake here of cases meerely Spirituall or ecclesiasticall, such as M. Carleton in his words last cited saith, *are so entirely reserued to the church, that the Prince can neither giue, nor take from it the iudgment therof.*

Againe, whatsoeuer this externall coercitiue power is, which the Prince hath in either of these, or other causes pertaining to the ecclesiasticall, yet is it not any such as he giueth, or communicateth to the Bishops, and Pastors of the church (who neither haue nor pretend to haue any such power) but to his ciuill and temporall magistrates. And therfore whatsoeuer this power is, it is wholly impertinent to M. Masons purpose, which is to shew that Bishops haue some part of their iurisdiction, necessary for the exercise of their episcopall power, from the Prince.

This saith M. Mason pag. 113.

He maie peraduenture saie, that the Prince giueth them licence, to exercise their functions freely within his territories, and therfore maie in some sense be said, to giue them iurisdiction in the same. But this is too too idle to be imagined. For neither is it in the Princes lawfull power to deny, or take awaie this leaue, or liberty from the preachers, and Pastors of Gods church, as is euident in all doctrine: Neither is this leaue necessarie for the lawfull exercise and executiō of episcopall power, as appeareth by the first planting of Christianitie in the world, which was effected without it, yea contrarie to the decrees, and ordinances of the temporall Princes. And our new reformers, who pretend to preach Gods word, and minister his Sacraments, do not expect the leaue of the temporall Prince, but thinke they may lawfully do it without their leaue, in case they will not giue it, as we see by dailie experience. No part therfore or parcell of Spirituall iurisdiction, haue the Bishops and Pastors of Gods church from the Prince, euen in our aduersaries owne doctrine.

And here before I come to ſhew, that our English Intendents haue as litle iuriſdiction from Chriſt, as they haue from the Prince, and conſequentlie that they haue none at all: I will put the reader in mind of a moſt vnchriſtian, and ſacrilegious kind of dealing in our English Prelates, both with God and their Prince.

First yeare of Elizabeth.

3. Firſt, they gaue their conſents, if not their counſels, for the eſtabliſhing of an oath, wherby the queene was ſworne, to be *ſupreame gouernor of her dominations in all things, or cauſes, aſwell ſpirituall or Eccleſiaſticall, as temporall*; the firſt refuſall wherof is premunire, the ſecond high treaſon; And alſo for the enacting of a ſtatute, wherby *all ſuch iuriſdictions, priuiledges, ſuperiorities, and preheminences ſpirituall, as by any ſpiritnall power hath hitherto bene, or lawfully may be vſed, for the viſitation of the Eccleſiaſticall ſtate and perſons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the ſame, and of all manner errours, hereſies, ſciſmes, abuſes, offences, contempts, and enemities are for euer vnited to the crowne of England*. By which ſtatute the latitude, or extent of the power aſcribed to the queene in the oath of ſupremacie, is in part declared, which oath is declared by the queenes iniunctions, to giue vnto the ſame authoritie, that king Henrie the 8. chalenged in the 26. yeare of his raigne, in a ſtatute of this tenour, as it is abridged by M. Poulton. *The King ſhalbe taken, and reputed the only ſupreame head in earth of the church of England, and ſhall haue power to redreſſe all errours, hereſies, and abuſes in the ſame.*

Anno 26. El. 8. c. 1.

Secondlie, they haue all of them taken the aforeſaid oath, and therfore haue by their proper fact approoued it as good and lawfull, wherby not onlie the Prince hath bene moued to exact the ſame of all her ſubiects, as both lawfull of it ſelfe, and of right due vnto her ſouereignte, but manie haue bene for the ſame reaſon moued, to take the ſame oath as lawfull.

All this notwithſtanding, do they in printed bookes teach, that Princes haue no ſuch ſpirituall authoritie, power, or iuriſdiction, as by the aforeſaid oath, and ſtatute is aſcribed vnto them. And therfore haue they either by their ſacrilegious periurie, not onlie themſelues highlie offended God, but alſo induced their ſouereigne, and manie of her ſubiects into the ſame offence,

offence, or els by their falſe doctrine do they manifeſtly derract from the lawfull power of their Prince and ſoueraigne. Whether of theſe two extreames they will make choice to confeſſe, I know not, but that they muſt neceſſarilie be guiltie of the one, I ſhall eaſelie proone, and euerie indifferent man will eaſilie ſee, their fault to be ſacrilegious periurie, ioined with pernicious flatterie of the Prince. But let vs ſee their doctrine, that therby we maie know how well it agreeth with their oath.

The whole cleargie of both prouinces (in their article agreed vpon, in the conuocatien holden at London the yeare 1561. and are of principall authoritie in their new church) ſay thus. *We giue not to our Princes, the miniſtring either of Gods word, or ſacraments.*

But I would know, why they giue not to the Princes this miniſterie: Is it becauſe they haue not power and authoritie requiſite for it? If it be ſo, why do they then ſweare, that they are ſupreame heads, and gouernors in all ſpirituall things or cauſes? For ſupreame gouernors haue power to do by themſelues all actions, vnder or within their gouernment, and which they can giue power to others to doe: As our Sauiour Chriſt being ſupreame head, and gouernor of his church, had power to do by himſelf all thoſe things, which he gaue power to others to do. So likewiſe ſoueraigne Princes haue the like power in all temporall cauſes within their dominions. Or is it becauſe this function is not worthie of their roiall dignitie? Indeede M. Maſon ſeemeth to inſinuate ſuch an anſwere. For giuing a reaſon, why our Princes did neuer practiſe the inflicting of Eccleſiaſticall cenſure, he ſaith, that it is becauſe *regall iuriſdiction conſiſteth not in a miniſteriall power, but in a ſupreame commanding authority.* But all Chriſtian eares will abhorre to heare ſuch a reaſon, ſeeing our Sauiour Chriſt the king of kings did exerciſe this miniſterie, of the word of God and his ſacraments, as pertaining directlie to his office and function. The doctrine therfore of this article can no more ſtand with the oath of ſupremacie, then can theſe two propoſitions accord together. *The Prince is ſupreame head and gouernor of all things, and cauſes ſpirituall*: And, *The Prince is not ſupreame head, and gouernor of all things or cauſes ſpirituall*. The former

Pag. 143.

mer is the same with the oath; the latter is the same, or equiualent with the article: and are directly contradictorie the one to thother, and therfore one of them necessarily false. The same contrariety betweene the said oath, and their doctrine, is shewed out of *Tortura Torti* expresly saying. *We giue not to the Prince power to inflict censures.* Therfore (do I inferr) do you not giue to the Prince, supreame power in all Spirituall things and causes, as you sweare. This saying of this author M. Mason citeth and approoueth.

Pag. 151.

Mason pag. 143.

But yet this is more plaine out of M. Carleton, who hath written a whole booke of this subiect, wherin he hath these expresse sayings. *The Fathers write for the Spirituall iurisdiction of the church aboue Princes, which we neuer denied.* Why do you sweare thē, that the Prince is supreame head, and gouernor of the church in all things, and causes Spirituall? how can the church haue Spirituall iurisdiction aboue the Prince, and yet the Prince be supreame head of the church, or gouernor of all Spirituall things? If these be not contradictions there are none at all to be found. Againe he saith. *We giue all Spirituall power to the church.* And yet againe. *The Spirituall gouernment of the church is committed to Spirituall gouernors, as first from Christ to his twelue Apostles: from them to Bishops and Pastors their successors.* How then can you without periurie sweare, that the Prince being neither Bishop, nor Pastor, is supreame gouernor in all things Spirituall? And yet more directly against the oath, and the statute, declaring the latitude of the power, giuen to the Prince in the oath before mentioned, he saith thus. *As for Spirituall iurisdiction of the church, standing in examinations of controuersies of faith, iudging of heresies, deposing of heretikes: excommunication of notorious and stubborne offenders, ordination of priests and deacons, institution and collation of benefices, and Spirituall cures &c. This we reserue entire to the church; which Princes cannot giue, nor take from the church. The Prince doth not medle with the keyes which God hath giuen to the church:* How this doctrine (which is true, though it be not the whole truth) can accord with the oath and statute mētioned, which giueth all this power to the Prince, passeth my capacity to conceiue. Infinite other proofes of the contrariety of their doctrine, with the oath which they haue sworne, might be brought: but till I see how they will reconcile, and satisfie these, I will spare farther labour.

In his admonition to the reader.

Pag 4. Pag. 5. 6.

Saith M. Mason pag. 113.

Both

5. Both M. Carleton and M. Maſon mention more then once, an externall coercitiue eccleſiaſticall iuriſdiction, which ſupreamly (as they ſaie) belongeth to the prince; wherby if they intend to ſatisfie the afore mentioned difficulty, and to reconcile their doctrine with their oath, they are farre short of their purpoſe. For firſt this iuriſdiction is ſo farre from being anie ſupreame eccleſiaſticall iuriſdiction that it is no waie eccleſiaſticall, or Spirituall, not reaching to any Spirituall thing at all, but reſting in the meere temporall, to wit the goods of nature, or fortune: as are life, liberty, lands, or goods, wherof the prince hath power to deprive, the declared obſtinate contemners of the eccleſiaſticall ordinaunces, and cenſures, but not to iudge of their cauſe or offence, as appeareth by their former doctrine. Now they know (if they know any thing in true Philoſophie) that the nature, or quality of euery power is meaſured by the obiect or thing, wherabout it is conuerſant, or wherunto it reacheth; ſo that this externall coercitiue power of the prince, reaching only to things temporall (for it toucheth no kind of Spirituall, or eccleſiaſticall thing, function, or action, as by M. Carletons doctrine before related is manifeſt) cannot by any meanes be Spirituall, or eccleſiaſticall, and much leſſe can it be ſupreame in that kind: Eſpecially ſeeing it can neither reuerſe, nor controll the Eccleſiaſticall iudgment but only helpe to accomplish the ſame, by inflicting of temporall penalties where the eccleſiaſticall cenſures are contemned: Neither can it euoque vnto it, the cauſes directly pertaining to the Spirituall court, or tribunall, but doth only receiue the delinquents already iudged therby, to proceed with them according to the rigour of the themporall law. *Vbi ſupra and M. Maſon pa. 143.*

Secondly, though this iuriſdiction were an eccleſiaſticall power (which is euidently falſe) yet would it not ſerue to excuſe them from ſacrilegious periurie, when they ſweare, *that the prince is ſupreame gouernor in all things, and cauſes Spirituall and that he hath all iuriſdiction and ſuperiority Spirituall that by any Spirituall power hath hitherto or may lawfully be vſed*, as the ſtatut before mentioned expreſly declareth.

For there is as great falſitie in this oath and ſtatut (though the coercitiue iuriſdiction were graunted to be Spirituall) as there

there would be in that, wherby any one should sweare, that King Iames is soueraigne lord ouer all the whole world. For as this oath is euidently false, notwithstanding that his maiesty be truly soueraigne lord of some part of the world, because he is not soueraigne ouer the whole, so is also that wherby it is sworne, that the prince is supreame gouernor of all things, and causes Spirituall, though it were true, that he had the coercitiue Spirituall iurisdiction. And this is true not only in it selfe, but euen in the doctrine of our English Protestants, who (as we haue seene) teach, that there are many things, wherin the prince hath no power, or iurisdiction nor can haue any.

Hence it is euident, first how vnlawfull, euen in the doctrine of the Protestants, themselues, the oath of supremacy is, being a manifest breach, of the second commaundement of the first table, as not only taking the name of God in vaine, as it happeneth in idle, and not necessary oathes though true, but also calling God to witnes, and to testifie a thing which they see and say to be euidently fals then which, can hardly be any greater offence committed by man.

Secondly it is euident how vniustly the Bishops, Heath, Bōner, White, and the rest of their brethren, were depriued of their Bishopricks in Q. Elizabeths time, for refusall of the same vnlawfull oath: and consequently, how manifest intruders they were, that were thrust into their places vpon the same refusall, wherof we haue spoken at large before.

Thirdlie, how vncertaine, and daungerous guides of soules these new prelates are, that by their publique suffrage in parlement first, and then by their owne personall fact in swearing, haue approoued an oath, which by their auerred and auowed doctrine is euidently false.

6. The resō also of this so shamelesse, and wicked doubling, in a matter of so great moment, is worthie to be obserued. For which purpose it is to be vnderstood, that the new incendents of the new church and gospell, seeing that the oath, and statute of supremacy did discharge them of all subiection, and obedience to the church, and Bishop of Rome their true and lawfull pastor, and therby gaue them liberty to bring into the Realme, their new doctrine and heresies, which without their separa-

ſeparation from the vnity of Gods church, and caſting of the yoke of obedience to their ſupreame paſtour, they ſaw well they could neuer effect, they were willing, and ready not only to giue waie vnto it, and to ſet it forward with their ſuffrages, but alſo to their owne perpetuall diſgrace, and diſhonour to ſweare therunto themſelues; I ſay to their owne diſgrace: For the temporall lords being by expreſſe act of parlement priuiledged, and exempted from taking the oath, they (the pretended Biſhops I meane) did baſely ſubiect themſelues therunto, wheras the freedome, and priuiledges of the lords Spirituall were alwaies equall, if not greater then thoſe of the temporall lords. But they that had already broken league with God, and his church, for the ſetting forward of their owne libertine fancies, no marueile though they made no difficultie, to morgage their honour and reputation, for the gaining of their Biſhoprickes. Hauing done this, and yet finding both by the litle light of naturall reaſon, that darke hereſie had left vnextinguiſhed in them, and alſo by the vnanſwerable arguments, of their Catholique aduerſaries at home, together with the diſauow of their moſt renowmed reformed brethren abroad, as Caluin, Centuriſts, Chemnitius, and others, that their fact was no waie to be iuſtified, no nor coloured; they to make their double diſſoialtie to God and his church, their prince and countrie, knowne to all the world, publiſh in their printed bookes, that they meane nothing leſſe, then to giue to the prince ſupreame power, and iuriſdiction in all things and cauſes Spirituall, which notwithſtanding they ſweare vnto in moſt expreſſe tearmes. For when they come to explicate, what ſupreame Spirituall; or eccleſiaſticall power the prince hath, they comprehend it all in an externall coercitiue power, by inflicting temporall penalties, which power is as much Spirituall, as oxen, horſes, houſes, lands, and mans life or libertie (to which things only this power doth reach, as is already noted) may be called Spirituall, ſo that they ſweare one thing, and teach the contrary. Now hauing noted this by the waie, I will returne to my former purpoſe, and prooue, that our Proteſtant prelates haue as litle iuriſdiction from Chriſt, as they haue from the prince, and conſequently that they haue none at all.

6. The iurisdiction, which they pretend to receiue immediatly from Christ, they saie they receiue by the meanes of their episcopall consecration, as M. Mason expresly teacheth, and they must all saie the same, hauing no other meanes wherby they maie receiue any iurisdiction. But our Protestant prelates haue no true episcopall consecration, as is already largely prooued. Therfore haue they not, nor can they haue any iurisdictiō from Christ. This argument (supposing the proofes of the nullity of their consecration to be effectuall, as till they be effectually answered, which neuer wilbe, they are to be esteemed) is vnanswerable as well in it selfe, as in their owne doctrine, which testifieth, that they haue no other iurisdiction from Christ, but that which they receiue by their episcopall consecration.

Mason pag. 145.

Cap. 12.

But I will (for the more cleare euicting of my purpose against them) suppose, contrary to the prooued truth, that their consecration is good and canonicall, and yet will I shew, that they cannot haue any iurisdiction from Christ. For the more easie and cleare proofe wherof, one or two grounds are to be laid before.

First that the power of order, which is giuen by consecration is so distinct from the power of iurisdiction, that thone maie be without thother. This is manifest by the vse of excommunication, suspension, deposition, and other censures (common as well with the Protestants as Catholiques) which though they take awaie the iurisdiction from the parties, vpon whom they are inflicted, and therby make all the exercise of the power of order in them to be vnlawfull, yet do they leaue entire the power of order, as M Mason often sheweth, and they must all confesse that allow the power of excommunication? Hence it is euident, that the power of iurisdiction cannot rightly be inferred, from the proofe of the power of order, because this may be without that.

Secondlie no crime doth either more iustlie, or euidentlie draw with it the censure of excommunication, and consequentlie the losse and depriuation of iurisdiction, then heresie or apostacie. For heretiques are excōmunicate by our Sauiours and the Apostles owne mouthes, who say *he that will not heare the church let him be as a publican and heathen*: and. *Flie a man that is an heretique,*

Math. 18. 17
Tit. 3. 10.

tique, as in the first and second diuision. Which is also so euident by the perpetuall practise, of the most auncient church, that it would be imprudence to procure it.

Thirdlie it is a receiued principle, and denied of none of common sense, that no man can giue to another that, which he hath not himselfe; as for example, he that hath not a groate cannot giue a groate to another. Euident therfore it is, that he that hath not iurisdiction himselfe, cannot possiblie giue it to another.

Out of these euident and receiued grounds, I conclude by as euident deduction, that our new Intendents in England haue no episcopall iurisdiction; though (as I said) it should be graunted against the truth, that they were truelie consecrated. Some may peraduenture thinke, that I will make ruine argument in this sort.

The pretended Bishops in England are condemned heretiques.

But all condemned heretiques are excommunicated and therby depriued of all Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction. Therfore our pretended Bishops in England are excommunicated, and deprined of all Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction. This argument indeed is cleare, and euerie proposition therof most true, yet because my aduersaries will wrangle vpon the first proposition, and denie themselues to be heretiques, and here I intend not to enter anie tedious dispute with them, especiallie hauing conuinced the same against thē alreadie, by foure seuerall argumēts, which they can neither solue nor retort, I will here vse an argument more free from all cauill, and no lesse effectuall against them in this sort. Cap. 11. n. 7.

If either the Protestant Prelates, or the Bishops of the Romane church, from whom they receiue their consecration, be heretiques, the Protestants can haue no episcopall iurisdiction.

But either the Protestant Prelates, or the Bishops of the Romane church are heretiques. Therfore, can the Protestant Prelates haue no episcopall iurisdiction.

The first proposition is cleare by the grounds before mentioned, and is euidentlie deduced in this sort. If the Bishops of the Romane church, from whom our new intendents pretend to

receiue their consecration (as we haue seene in this whole treatise) and consequentlie their episcopall iurisdiction, which they say they receiue with their consecration, were heretiques, they were excommunicate, and therby did they loose their iurisdiction, which hauing lost, they could not giue it to their Protestant successors, and if the Protestant intendents were heretiques, they could receiue no iurisdiction for the same reason: So that the first proposition is cleare: the second is without all debatable controuersie; The conclusion followeth naturallie, and necessarilie of the premisses: Therfore the whole argument, wher by it is concluded, that the Protestant intendents haue no Episcopall iurisdiction, is euidentlie cleare.

7. And now will I wind vp our whole dispute with our English Protestant Prelates, in this short and perspicuous argument.

The whole ecclesiasticall power of Bishops and pastors consisteth of the power of order, and the power of iurisdiction. But the English Protestant Prelates haue neither power of ordor, nor iurisdiction. Therfore haue they no part of ecclesiasticall power. The first proposition is cleare, and denied of no English Protestant, the second hath bene prooued by sundrie arguments, which neuer will haue anie true, or effectuall answere or solution, the conclusion is necessarie, supposing the truth of the premises. And therfore do our English pretended Bishops remaine, prooued no Bishops, no not ecclesiasticall persons, but meere lay men.

The consequences that necessarilie folow hereupon are briefly deduced in the later end of the precedent chap. n. 29. turn back thither and see them.

8. And now for a farwell to M. Mason, I would know of him, how he can iustifie the discent, and succession of their Bishops, from those of the Romane church, who had their iurisdiction from the see of Rome, without incurring the premunire; this being a manifest defending, and acknowledging of the lawfull power of the Bishop, and see of Rome in England, at least for the time past. Whence it farther followeth, that if it was euer lawfull, it is, or at least ought to be lawfull now, and euer hereafter. For if the Bishop of Rome euer had anie lawfull po-

8. Eliza. 1.

wer

wer in England (as doubtles he had, and M. Maſon muſt needs graunt it, vnles he will fruſtrate his whole proofe of their lawfull ſucceſſion, from the Biſhops of the Romane church) he had it by ſuch power, as cannot by temporall lawes be impaired, or taken away. M. Maſon therfore is to aduiſe with himſelfe, whether he will quit, and renounce the proofe of their conſecration, and vocation, taken from their ſucceſſion to the Catholique Biſhops, (the onlie true proofe, of the lawfull calling of Eccleſiaſticall paſtors) or ſtanding therunto, will incurre the daunger of premunire; which, if he ſhould find but equall iudges, I thinke he would not eaſilie auoide, as neither his directors, or abbettors in this worke, whoſe penaltie in theſe caſes are knowne, to be like, with that of the principall offender. He and they may peraduenture relie, vpon the grace of the prince for their pardons: which trulie I do not enuie them, but thinke they haue in ſome ſort deſerued fauour, not hauing committed this tranſgreſſion altogether voluntarilie, but vpon a certaine neceſſitie, not finding anie other meanes, to maintaine the calling of their new miniſterie. Yet I thought good to let them know, that the world taketh notice of ſuch a repugnancie in their miniſterie, euen with their owne parlement lawes, that it cannot be maintained without the tranſgreſſion of them: which manifeſtlie argueth, that either their lawes are vniuſt, or their miniſterie vnlawfull. I ſay either, not becauſe both maie not be, or *de facto* are not, but becauſe thone is infalliblie inferred, vpon the repugnance found betwixt them.

9. Some maie peraduenture thinke, that to the full accomplishment of this treatiſe, ſhould be added ſome proofe of the true calling of the Catholique paſtors, becauſe it is not a ſufficient eſtabliſhment of the truth in this point, as likewiſe in none other, to haue reiected, and refuſed that which is falſe, vnles the truth be alſo made manifeſt. But we are quit of this trauaile by our aduerſaries themſelues, who pleading, that their beſt right, and title to epiſcopall calling, is receiued from our Biſhops of the Romane church, muſt neceſſarilie confeſſe, that they haue at leaſt ſufficient calling, (for it is otherwaies altogether vnpoſſible, they ſhould deriue it vnto them) with which acknowledgment we are content for this time, eſpeciallie hauing alreadie iuſtified the ſame

same calling in that point of a sacrificing power, and priesthood, which is the cheefe, or onlie thing they carpe at in the same. And though this iustification of the calling of the Catholique Bishops, and pastors, might be sufficient, yet will I adde farther and aboue, this briefe argument.

10. The Bishops of the Catholique Romane church haue the same calling, which the Apostles deliuered vnto their immediate successours. But they deliuered to their successors the true, and lawfull calling. Therfore the Bishops of the Catholique Romane church haue the true, and lawfull calling.

The first proposition (which being made good the whole argument is euident) is thus prooued. The Bishops of the Catholique Romane church receiue their calling, by not interrupted succession from the Apostles: which our aduersaries can with no more reason denie, then they can denie, that the same sunne, which God created in the beginning of the world, doth now shine vnto vs, but that it is some other made since; vnles they can shew when, where, and by whom this other calling, which they pretend to be now in the Romane church was brought in, which they can no more doe, then they can shew the change of the sunne. Therfore doth it remaine cleare, that the calling of the Catholique Bishops is the same, which the Apostles deliuered to their immediate successours, and consequentlie the true and lawfull calling. When this argument shalbe solued by anie other answere, then maie in the same manner be applied to the instance made of the change of the sunne; I will confesse it to be satisfied; till then; I shall esteeme it vnanswerable, and consequentlie, the calling of the Catholique Bishops therby inuincible prooued.

THE CONCLVSION TO THE CAREFVLL READER.

HAVING thus shewed (carefull Reador) that no sect or sort of Protestants, or those that falsly pretend the reformation of the Catholique Romane religion in these our daies, haue any true Pastors or teachers, and namelie that those who now beare the names of Bishops in England are no true or lawfull Bishops, but meere vsurpers of that title, and consequentlie that all the inferiour Pastors, Preachers, or Ministers ordered or sent by them, haue no māner of lawfull calling or commission to preach or Minister Gods word, or Sacraments to his people, but are such as the holie scriptures call false Prophets, theeues, robbers, and wolues, if thou hast but the least sense, care, or feeling of thine owne eternall saluation (which if thou shouldest loose, it were better for thee a thousād times that thou hadst neuer bene borne) thou wilt quicklie and carefullie prouide, that thou do not liue and dy a mēber or professour of any one of those sects. For seeing it is a truth, both most euident in it selfe, and confessed by all Protestants of what pretended reformation soeuer, that where there are no true or lawfull Pastors, there can be no true church (the church being no other thing then the sheepe vnited with the Pastor, or the people with their Bishop) and further that where there is no true church there can be no true faith *(the church being the house of God, the piller and ground of truth,)* as witnesseth S. Paul. And yet further that where there is no true faith, there can be no true meane of Saluation (S. Paul also teaching that, *without true faith it is impossible to please God:*) These things I saie, being both euident in themselues, and confessed by all Protestants, thou canst not be so blind as to thinke that thou maist find thy saluation amongst any sect of Protestants, who are so euidentlie prooued to haue no Pastors. And so desiring in thee no other disposition to come to the true knowledge of the meane to saue thy soule, then only an effectuall desire to saue it, with a competent consideration of the points here briefflie deduced, I leaue thee to Gods most holy grace, who hath not only made

1. ad Timoth. 3. 14.

Ad Hebr. 11. 6.

thee to his owne Image, but hath redeemed thee with the most pretious blond of his only Sonne, and this neither for any profit of his, or merite of thine, but for his owne goodnes, and that thou maist be a saued soule in his eternall kingdome, where I beseech God we may once meete.

* *
*

FINIS.

Courteous Reader, the authors absence from the presse having caused diuers escapes in the print, be pleased to vse the obseruations following, for the correction of the most and chiefest of them.

Page 14. the three first lines are to be read as a marginall note, and not as pertayning to the text.

pag. 217. is the deposition of Abiather by Salomon spoken of, which by errour is repeated againe pag. 238.

For the rest note, that the fault is not expressed in this table, but the correction onlie, the letter r. signifyng, *Reade*, the letter. e. the number of lines, not from the beginning, but from the end of the page.

The Ciphers of the pages from 89, vnto 100. are false, and 196. and 266. and 315.

Faults in the text.

PAge 5. lin. from. the end 7. r. we will wittinglie. p. 6. l. 1. put out, obserueth. p. 7. l. 7. e. r. institution. p. 10. l. 3. r. prosecuted, pag. 13. l. 26. r. Ministerie. p. 16. l. 16 e. wanteth a full point. before (we) p 18. l. 1. n. answere. p. 25. l. 13. e. r. how seuere. p. 32. l. 9. e. put out (no). p. 34. l. 23. r. Roman. p. 35. l. 8. e. r. easilie. p. 38. l. 14. e. r. must needes do, that. p. 39. l. 13. e. r. these. p. 47. l. 5. r. alwaies ioyned. p. 48. l. 6. r. condigne. p. 50. l. 19. r. what. p. 50. l. 3. e. r. true. p. 53. l. 5. r. thrust. p. 53. l. 9. r. then thy. p. 55. l. 6. e. r. ordaine. p. 56. l. 18. e. put out (as). p. 57. l. 5. e. r. now. p. 59 l. 13. r. nor take. p. 67. l. 3 e. r. Arius. p. 73. l. 7. r. hath heard. p. 74. l. 4. r. 1500. yeares. p. 77. l. 15. e. r. or gouernement. p. 86. l. 17. e. r. seeing. p. 93. l. 6. e. r. I wis. l 3. r. doth quite. p. 94. l. 1. r. source. p. 97. l. 7. r. either. p. 97. l. 3. e. r. and, therfore. p. 107. l. 7. r. not interrupted. p. 111. l. 4. r. The reason. p. 115. l. 11. e. r. separated from. p. 116. l. 17. r. M. Mason, and so euer after. p. 116. l. 9. e. r. now are. p. 132. l. 4. r. or brand. p. 156. l. 15. r. the whole. p. 159. l. 5. r. do consist. p. 161. l. 10. r. was euer. p. 161. l. 3 e r. Richard Shilders. p. 162. l. 9. r. teacheth that. p. 165. l. 9. put out (in their doctrine) p. 169. l. 4. r. iudge Dyar. p. 171. l. 10. r. insufficient, p. 172. l. 12. e. r. presumptuous law. p. 173. l. 9. r. further. p. 173. l. 13. e. r. and the manner. p. 174. l. 9 e. r. anie quirke. p. 175. l. 14. e. r. thinke it. p. 176. l. 13. r. against ther. p. 177. l. 16 r not leaue. l. 8 e. after (speake) want these words (more by and by, and namelie when we come to speake) p. 183. l. 8. r. began to be. p. 187. l. 7. e. r. Poynet. p. 189. l. 1. r. puritie of the gospell. p. 191. l. 2. e. r. one halfe proofe. p. 196. l. 6. r. he had alreadie. p. 203. l. 11. r. sees. l. 14. r. Coxe. l. 2. e. r. bring one out. p. 207. l. 18. e. r. may not. p. 213. l. 3. e. r. condemned. p 217. l. 4. e. r. I wil remit the reader to the Chapter following and to the last Chapter. p. 223. l. 11. e. r. he can.

p. 256.

p. 238. l. 7. e. r. hoſtes. p. 237. l. being not able. l. 14. r. lawfull vſe. p. l. 11. r. how farre the power of the keies. p. 253. l. 5. e. r. is alſo true. p. l. 21. r. antithéſis. p. 262. l. 10. e. r. law written, but alſo to the Gentiles in law of nature. p. 264. l. 17. e. r. and owes. p. 265. l. 4. e. r. doth euidentlie. p. 266. l. 15. r. at laſt. p. 267. l. 17. r. are like l. 15. e. r. there are. p. 270. l. 15. e. r. a torne coate. p. 271. l. 2. e. r. thother reproued. p. 272. l. 20. r. being thus vnderſtood. l. 15. e. put out (conformitie with true reaſon.) l. 2. e. r. his laſt ſupper. p. 280. l. 9. r. letter S. l. 11. r. incorrupt antiquitie. p. 283. l. 6. r. ijs qui, l. 15. e. r. 1270. yeares. l. 1. e. r. rogamus te. p. 286. l. 6. r. paſt. l. 13. p. & diuinitati. p. 290. l. 7. e. r. orantes. p. 292. l. 15. r. tanta fidelium. p. 310. l. 9. r. which waie. p. 311. l. 13. e. r. in the ſtrict, p. 314. l. 16. r. collation, p. 316. l. 9. r. her dominions, l. 19. e. r. to giue vnto her, p. 317. l. 11. r. articles agreed vpon in the conuocation. p. 323. l. 14. r. make mine.

Faults in the margent.

PAg. 71. r q. Armenor. ibidem for. g. 9. r. q. 9. p. 78. in the citation of Illiricus r. 730. 731. p. 116. r. Ezechiel. 13. 11. p. 142. r. 81. p. 143. r. act. 1. p. 213. r. orat. ad ciues timore epiſt. 32. p. 234. r. is from god but what then? will it follow that humane reaſon. p. 235. r. 22. p. 248. r. 209. p. 273. wanteth the quotation of Ireneus. l. 4. C. 32. p. 283. r. orat. p. 291. adde the quotation of S. Auguſtine ſer. 32. in verba apoſtoli ad Theſſalonicenſes. p. 293. r. vnanſwerable apologie. p. 297. r. ad Hebr. 7, ſect. 6.